THE

NEW REVIEW.

No. 22.—MARCH, 1891.

A SONG.

TO sleep! to sleep! The long bright day is done,
And darkness rises from the fallen sun.
To sleep! to sleep!
Whate'er thy joys, they vanish with the day;
Whate'er thy griefs, in sleep they fade away.
To sleep! to sleep!
Sleep, mournful heart, and let the past be past!
Sleep, happy soul! all life will sleep at last.
To sleep! to sleep!

TENNYSON.

THE RISE AND FALL OF MR. PARNELL.

WE often hear of the eyes of the civilised world being fixed on certain situations, and, without exactly claiming the attention of all humanity, it is certain that the cockpit in Ireland will command a good "gallery" for some time to come. The position is most interesting politically, but it also borrows interest from sources altogether apart from politics. Politically, the fortunes of one or other of the great English parties may depend on the course of events in Ireland, but, pending the General Election, the action of the personal drama is certain to move men's minds.

Mr. Parnell has got a good grip on the public imagination, and his character in process of *detritus* will be well worth study. His talents are indisputable; his opportunities endless. With whom can he be compared for indifference to opinion, for hardihood of statement, for resolute purposefulness, for audacity and resource in the propagation of his schemes? Napoleon, to whom he has been likened, had many weaknesses. The Corsican saw that his soldiers were shod and fed, and underwent with them the rigours of the campaign. The incident in which he is represented as ordering a forlorn assault to feast the eyes of a mistress on a bloody spectacle has been denied.

The Irishman's qualities are his own, and on a more stunted stage are much more useful for his purposes. The inroad on Mr. Parnell's stoicism at Kilkenny was probably only temporary. It shocked the public when his success seemed certain, that, surrounded by bands and banners and a roaring mob, to whom he foretold an assured victory, he should have so badly lost his temper.

But Mr. Parnell was not ill-tempered, and his tactics were well

enough. For a man of limited vocabulary to have to make three or four speeches every day for three weeks is sorely trying; and having in addition to expose the "treason" of old comrades, it was not, from one point of view, such bad judgment to try and reach the popular ear by short cuts. Scum, hound, gutter-sparrow, jackdaw, knave, thief, contain ideas in too compressed a form for the usage of drawing-rooms, but Mr. Parnell was on the hustings, and no one in Ireland, save the State porter at Dublin Castle, cares for Drawing-rooms.

Until the ballot boxes were opened, could it have been foreseen that the populace were not to be caught by commination from the mouth of a high priest? There really was no malice in anything Mr. Parnell said when he declared that Dr. Tanner, in 1875, had murdered a famous Cork M.P. by botchy surgery: the moment this speech was over, Mr. Parnell went to the reporters and kind-heartedly got the sentence omitted from the newspapers. It was just his way of carrying the crowd against an opponent at the moment, and as Dr. Tanner was too young to be a surgeon fifteen years ago, there was no personal ill-will in the allusion. Moreover, the moment a writ for slander was served, Mr. Parnell handsomely apologised. The Kilkenny incidents, therefore, arose not from faults of character, but from mere mistakes of judgment. These will not be repeated. Mr. Parnell has resumed his native demeanour and soared home into the trackless altitudes of statecraft. Versatility was an unsuspected gift in Mr. Parnell, but the moment the need developed the talent was there: and who knows how many more lie slumbering in the depths of his character? Psychologically, therefore, a man wielding Mr. Parnell's influence (be the same more or less) must always be an interesting character. How long this influence will last is another matter. To the dull public the man will doubtless lose interest when his power vanishes, but, for the judicious, interest in things "fearfully and wonderfully made" will not stop at a General Election. Napoleon at St. Helena is limned oftener than Napoleon at Versailles. Probably no individual politician ever acquired so potent an influence over a people as Mr. Parnell. The concentration of power in his hands was so great that it led to the *Times* conspiracy, *viâ* Pigott, to destroy him.

Such concentration, while valuable for many purposes, was also a danger in the temptation it created in the minds of opponents to try to shatter the repository. Neither Mr. Gladstone nor Mr. Disraeli could at any time have nominated the representatives of five-sixths of a country. O'Connell could not have done it. Gambetta could not do it. Mr. Parnell and Ireland became convertible terms. The Irish people placed their fortunes in his hands, asking for nothing but results, just as confiding shareholders invest their savings on the faith of directors' names and resent any attack on them as an assault on the credit of the company, lest the dividend might be affected. Until the crash came the system worked well. It was an extremely convenient thing for English statesmen to be able to treat with an individual exercising unquestioned authority in his country and with his party. It was useful at home, when elections had to be carried in the teeth of local jealousies or ambitions, to have a standard name and authority to appeal to by which irritation could be appeased and rivalries pacified. Evils, of course, the system had, but these could only be foreseen by prophets, and prophets nowadays have neither honour in their own country nor anywhere else. The chief mischief no one exactly divined—the deterioration which unchecked power seems to produce in the mind of its possessor.

Mr. Parnell was not a tyrannical man, nor unkindly, nor over-exacting. The stories about his hauteur and insolence to his followers are simply lies. In ten years, perhaps not more than once have we seen him other than affable and courteous. His besetting sin was over-caution, which finally bred in him mistrust and untruth and silent jealousy. Weighted by enormous responsibilities, and surrounded by watchful enemies, he felt the importance of keeping himself uncommitted; and his secret habits of life fitted in with his train of thought, the one reacting on the other. Nothing but the intense loyalty of his party could have stood during two Parliaments the strain of his prolonged absences and neglect; but that loyalty was not shown for him but for the country, as each man regarded any matter of attack on their leader not upon the merits, but in the light of the satisfaction and advantage which the enemy would

derive from dissension. Mr. Parnell was not only fully alive to this feeling, but used it as his stock-in-trade, and quietly, and as a matter of course, for the last five years filled up vacancies in the Irish representation without consulting either his party or the constituencies. When he was wanted in the House he remained in the country, and when he attended would not sit through a debate for more than an hour or two. Probably, since 1881, Mr. Parnell has not sat out a sitting, as scores of minor men do when the business interests them. Dissatisfaction at his absences and neglect of duty greatly helped the change which Mr. Gladstone's letter brought about. Men said: "If we keep on Mr. Parnell he will act worse than ever, while we shall lose the active sympathy of the Liberals if Mr. Gladstone is driven into retirement." The greatest mistake Mr. Parnell made was in not defending the proceedings against him. It could not have hurt him unless he desired the divorce; but the habit of thought he had acquired made him fancy himself impregnable against public opinion. His next blunder was in allowing it to be given out that he was going to retire, and causing the men who had supported him, with a view to make his retreat easy and dignified, to feel they had been sold. When these men signed a requisition calling a meeting to ask him to reconsider his position, he blundered again; for he insulted the bearer of their message, declared he would not attend their meeting, and then went up and seated himself in the chair: when, instead of taking them into his confidence and discussing the situation in a friendly spirit, he employed the tactics of obstruction. Worst of all, however, was the manifesto. Having secured an adjournment from Wednesday to Monday, Mr. Parnell employed the interval in penning a document declaring that his colleagues' integrity had been sapped, and that he had hitherto been deceiving them and the world as to his satisfaction with Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme. Accordingly, when the party met on the Monday, he was face to face with an exasperated majority who believed that their generosity had been abused, and that they had to deal with a man absolutely unscrupulous and faithless. They found, moreover, that he had used the four days' grace he had applied for to rig the

constituencies in Ireland: that the wires had been set working, and hundreds of telegrams transmitted with a view to provoke manifestations represented as spontaneous in favour of "the chief." But the worst service rendered to Mr. Parnell was by a daily paper in Dublin, which in his interest attempted to bully opponents. The members attacked all knew personally the writers of the libels upon them, gauged their mental stature, and thoroughly despised the Parnellite press-gang. With so many combustibles, nothing but sheer burning out of the material could put out the blaze.

Given his position, Mr. Parnell fought well. The qualities which enabled him to preside as chairman day after day over the meetings of a party called to discuss his right to the chairmanship, and to obstruct and defy its authority, were those which had stood him in such good stead in former times. Phrases like "dirty little scoundrel" were now and then wrung from the poor man, but generally his conduct was dignified. His rulings on points of order could hardly be expected to be impartial, and his interruptions of hostile speakers were the result of method and not of passion. Forty-four times Mr. Parnell broke in on a half-hour speech of mine, which his supporters interrupted thirty-three additional times, making seventy-seven scores in all. It was a great advantage to him, therefore, to have had Mr. Parnell in the chair! The general line of battle which he selected was also excellent, namely, that the Liberals, with a view to cheat Ireland of her rights, had made the divorce a pretext to rid themselves of her most formidable champion. Having determined to violate the pledge which bound each member of the Irish party by the vote of the majority, it was necessary to invent some exalted reason of State to justify a national disruption, and here was the wherewithal to invest both himself and his supporters with the requisite dignity. Next he had to throw discredit on the anti-Parnellites, and this he attempted by suggesting what in Ireland is the most odious of all charges—the accusation of place-hunting. These were admirable tactics; and thus the gospel of the Parnellites to their countrymen to explain their leader's deposition became most simple and convincing. His opponents, they said, sacrificed him because he was the

watchful shepherd who prevented them selling, for value received, the Irish fold to the English wolves, and these English wolves had, in the sheep's clothing of Gladstonianism, been attempting by fair false words to befool Ireland about Home Rule. Not even the finest fleece of lambswool over lupine jaws should thenceforth, they vowed, deceive a Parnellite, who alone would do chivalrous knight-service in their country's cause. This, be it remembered, was most excellent ammunition on a battle-ground almost every turf of which is the scene of some perfidy or cruelty committed by those who represented English domination in Ireland in days not long gone by.

The effect in certain circles was immediate. Only a few days after the divorce case, the promoters of a meeting in Cork (Mr. Parnell's own constituency), to promote the release of the prisoners convicted for alleged participation in dynamite outrages, refused to allow a resolution of confidence in him to be proposed ; but no sooner had he rent his party in twain than the same individuals met and voted confidence *galore* in the victim of "English wolves." Similar conversions amongst similarly minded individuals soon cropped out all over Ireland. The extreme party has always contained the boldest and most self-sacrificing spirits in its ranks in rural Ireland, and for them Mr. Parnell's story was catching and natural, while they imagined they had captured in him a great recruit for their own policy. During the Kilkenny election, however, a manifesto, boldly addressed to what Captain O'Shea, at the Special Commission, called "the Hillside men," was foolishly repudiated by Mr. Parnell, and though he managed to keep the repudiation out of his own organs, it was, of course, cabled to America. With the clergy and nine-tenths of the respectable laity against him at home and abroad, Mr. Parnell should, in my judgment, boldly have taken his stand with the men who were befriending him. If small in number, they are most useful by their organisation and zeal ; and Mr. Parnell, having cut himself adrift from his Special Commission evidence, was hardly well-advised to repudiate a placard appealing for their help, and paid for by the moneys of his candidate.

This, however, was only an incident of the Kilkenny battle, which was most ably and well fought for Mr. Scully, and which, according to all the laws of war (like Waterloo), should really have been decided

the other way. Mr. Parnell brought down several members of Parliament, he had all the bands in the county apparently, and, except in one town, all the mob. In a rousing election fight half a dozen good mobsmen might fairly be swapped against a score of persons in broadcloth. A well-conducted mob has carried many an election in times past, and as most of the publicans and all the brewers were on Mr. Parnell's side, they did not want for commissariat. The Saturday before the polling, however, a profound mistake was made. Being market day in Kilkenny city, a large crowd of voters gathered to hear the speeches from a hotel window, fronting the wide market-place. As Mr. Parnell spoke a rustic funeral came in sight. Mr. Redmond, knowing the Catholic reverence for the dead, pulled at his leader and asked him to stop till the humble *cortège* had passed. Mr. Parnell, however, persisted, and just as the coffin with the poor mourners following came abreast of the window, an inspiration caught him, and he pointed at it, shrieking, "There goes the hearse of Sir John Pope Hennessy." Even in savage or pagan countries this, probably, would be something worse than bad form. The Kilkenny farmers turned round to follow the outstretched finger and shuddered, seeing at what it pointed. For them it was not merely an uncanny or heartless parable. It was a ghastly, irreligious outrage on the dead. Coming from the "illustrious Parnell," whom they had been taught to regard as the pearl of knightly courtesy, it was unpardonable. The funeral passed on, the meeting melted away, and from mouth to mouth passed the story of the outrage on the dead. The priests, then, were not wrong about this man. Kilkenny was lost.

Will Mr. Parnell do better at other elections? Will any members of the majority go back to him? Will any member of the minority desert him? To each question, "No" is the answer. As to the Irish members, the conduct of the men on both sides is remarkable. There are no waverers. Every man is solid for or against Parnell. When the hour for voting came every man on both sides was in his place, nobody wanted to be neutral, no one who could be present was away. Trained politicians make splendid partisans. Most of Mr. Parnell's colleagues believe that they will never be re-elected, but that does not affect them. They have taken

their side, and they will hold to it. In 1886 I greatly admired the tactics of the Unionist leaders in "corralling" the Liberal weak-knees into voting against the Home Rule Bill. Mr. Chamberlain first had his spies feeling their way through the party, making soundings for mutineers, then a bunch of them were invited by Lord Hartington to Devonshire House, then, as the snowball grew and the Dissentients took courage, Mr. Bright addressed them. When, to checkmate these tactics, Mr. Gladstone assembled and appeased the entire party by concession and discussion at the Foreign Office, a motion was made in the House that afternoon compelling the Prime Minister to divulge his confidences to the world, and forthwith his assurances were assailed as worthless by the united strength of Dissent and Toryism. Finally, when many of the doubters were for abstaining on the day of the division, a meeting was called in a Committee Room (query, 15?), and passionate addresses were poured out on them by the Stalwarts to save their country. After Mr. Gladstone's letter Mr. Parnell handled his men with equal adroitness. His friends being few in number, he could easily and conveniently assemble them, and this he did night after night at his hotel. Feelers for support were continually being thrown out, and now and then a straggler was brought in. To the doubting he talked, he urged, he implored; and all the time the wires were going in the constituencies, where little groups were being rallied to declare in the name of Humanity, Patriotism, and Ballyhooly, that their member should support "the only possible leader." Any friend who could bring pressure on any member was summoned to London, and no device that blarneying or bullying could devise was left untried to secure a majority. When the party met, and after two days' debate rejected the first motion to adjourn the decision to Dublin by a majority of fifteen, Mr. Parnell only redoubled his efforts. His watchword to encourage his friends then was, "We only need eight men to have the majority." Quite true, but not a man stirred. Had the party adjourned to Dublin a crowd of picked men had been organised to overawe debate and mob the members of the majority, and quite possibly an effort might have been made to debar the attendance of some of them when the roll was called.

It is ninety years since there was a Parliament in Dublin, and only a dozen since the repeal of the Convention Act first allowed deliberative assemblies for any purpose in Ireland. A resort to violence has been the only means the people knew to be effective to make their opinions felt, and to violence, unfortunately, they were encouraged by Mr. Parnell's leading organ.

Nevertheless, all Mr. Parnell's influence or resources could not bribe, bully, or seduce a single follower to his side from the ranks of the majority. The delirium is now over, or the cash expenditure has been checked. The power he wielded through possessing the only popular Dublin daily paper will disappear in a week or two with the starting of a rival organ, and the movement of opinion is ebbing from instead of flowing towards him. He has not ventured to resign his seat, nor could he safely do so, and no one of Mr. Parnell's followers ventures to test the feeling of his constituents. Both John and William Redmond specially pledged themselves in Committee Room 15 (in addition to the written pledge which all have signed) to resign or go with the majority, but that is three months ago, and the vacancies have not been created. Possibly, out of thirty-three followers Mr. Parnell will return eight at a General Election. He will certainly not return a dozen. The remainder of the seats, except those which will be presented to the Tories, will go to the majority. The Tory gains will be either five or six votes, and the Irish party will return to Parliament over seventy strong, the exact estimate being seventy-three. Mr. Parnell, of course, thinks or says otherwise, on the strength of galvanised meetings and torchlight processions carefully organised. It is not the froth on the waves that disturbs the pebbles on the shore, and the permanent forces of life in Ireland are arrayed against Mr. Parnell. Except with the help of the Tories he cannot get funds to fight the General Election, while his opponents will be in no such straits, as there is not a constituency in Ireland that will not start a campaign fund to fight the Parnellite nominees. There are a number of very brave and honest men on Mr. Parnell's side, but they cannot raise £30,000 for an election. His opponents in a fortnight raised a far larger sum to found a daily paper, and have no anxiety as to the result of an appeal to the country either

for votes or cash. In America funds cannot be raised for faction. The servant-girl's-dollar theory lingers in England as to the source of Irish-American subscriptions, but gifts of tens, twenties, hundreds, and even thousands of pounds which have swelled the League treasury can only come from substantial men, and these are all against Mr. Parnell. The dollars of the poor, however, were the first to come to the aid of Ireland in her distresses. They were always given the most unselfishly, and I do not believe they will be paid to divide a nation. A non-contentious outlet for generosity will always exist in providing for the relief of evicted tenants, and the greatest mischief which Mr. Parnell has done has been the peril in which he has placed the position of those men. It is idle to deny that the future of these poor men has been darkened by the scandal which has arisen ; hence every landlord in Ireland is now cordially on Mr. Parnell's side. They know that the division which has taken place in the Irish party is more or less reflected throughout the rural leagues, and that without unity in combination the demands of the peasantry can easily be resisted. Hence the split has probably at this moment added from three to five years' purchase to the value of their land. For my own part, however, I do not believe in the permanence of the division. Ireland knows too well the value of unity and has tasted too bitterly the fruits of dissension to tolerate it for very long. But the split will not be patched up. It will rather be filled in with the remains and reputations of the combatants, and a reunited party will be organised to continue the struggle. Her enemies will never write *Finis* over Ireland's tomb.

T. M. HEALY.

MR. GLADSTONE CLOSE AT HAND.

A PERSONAL SKETCH.

WHATEVER value may attach to this faint outline of a great personality is created solely by the fact that I confine myself strictly to points which have come directly under my own observation. It is not for me to perpetrate the absurdity of attempting the delineation of a historical figure ; I can neither lay down the lines, nor fill in the colours, nor realise the vital atmosphere, appropriate to so stately a representation. I can simply hint at a ew of the things which have come under my own notice, and thus help to bring some readers a little nearer to a man to whom even his opponents would accord no small degree of personal and public honour. I come to my work the more willingly because of the desire of many in America who feel the keenest interest in everything that throws light on the most illustrious Englishman of his day. Henry Ward Beecher once said to me :

"Not Queen Victoria herself would excite so much interest in America as Mr. Gladstone, were he to come."

Another distinguished American bore similar testimony.

"What reception would you give Mr. Gladstone in this country?" was my inquiry.

"He would never be allowed to land," was the startling answer.

"What do you mean?" said I.

"Because when the time of his arrival was known there would be a solid block of men that would stretch right back from New York to Chicago, and it would be impossible so to break it up as to give Mr. Gladstone room to get on shore."

Now to my sketch.

On one occasion I ventured to ask the late Dean Stanley whether he thought Mr. Gladstone had any sense of humour. The Dean paused a moment, which may be accounted for by the fact that he was dining, if such abstemious eating and drinking may be described by so active a term. With the sweetest smile, and with a characteristic quivering of the eyelids, the Dean looked at me and slowly said : "Ye-es ; but of rather a grim sort." I never heard the word "grim" so inoffensively or so suggestively uttered. The capsule was bigger than the pill. Yet even Mr. Gladstone can once in a decade be seduced into the telling of an anecdote. I was at Dollis Hill on one occasion when he told a large company that his son Herbert was addressing a meeting in Yorkshire when a genuine son of the soil interrupted a sentence by the inquiry, "How's *feyther?*" It was unanimously agreed that Mr. Gladstone's Yorkshire would have passed muster even in Leeds itself. But anecdotes do not detain him long. Only in a qualified sense can I admit Mr. Gladstone's lack of humour. What lack there is seems to me to be a lack of proportion. I have seen Mr. Gladstone address himself to a mutton chop with about the same energy that David must have displayed when he cut off the head of Goliath. Mr. Gladstone never tickles any man to death. He gives him one sharp turn between the upper and the nether millstone, and the rest is powder. I fancy that if Mr. Gladstone told stories there would be a strong dash of tragedy about them ; yet that Mr. Gladstone can appreciate comedy I know from direct observation. He can, too, fall into the humour of whimsical situations. One of his private secretaries told me, many years ago, that a party of officials, with whom Mr. Gladstone breakfasted once a week, plotted in order to test his information upon unusual topics.

"First of all," said he, "we got up the subject of round churches but we soon found that he knew their number, their age, their capacity, and a good deal more than we did. Then we got upon the subject of roses, their varieties, their colours, and all the rest of it, but once more he floored us. At last he began to suspect us, and told us so, and the whole thing passed off in a hearty laugh."

That private secretary all but adored his chief. Commend

me to a man's assistants when I want to know the real quality of the man. A curious illustration of this occurred in a railway carriage some time ago. Some rough-spoken fellows were denouncing Mr. Gladstone to their hearts' content, and were not a little surprised to hear a voice say: "I wish I was half as good a man as my master."

"And who may your master be?"

The quiet answer was, "Mr. Gladstone."

Mr. Gladstone has been kind enough to allow me to put him through a sort of written catechism, from which I am at liberty to make what quotations I please. The form into which I shall throw this unique interview will in no degree impair the exactness of Mr. Gladstone's replies. It will be enough to remember that the mere setting alone is so arranged as to secure a little artistic liberty.

"Taken for all in all," said I, "who is the greatest Parliamentary speaker on the Conservative side, within your personal knowledge?"

"It is very difficult," Mr. Gladstone replied, "to find a common measure for such men as Peel, Lord Derby, Disraeli, Lord Lyndhurst, and Lord Ellenborough."

On another occasion Mr. Gladstone mentioned a living name with no reluctant appreciation. He frankly described Lord Salisbury as a most brilliant man. I think the world may be challenged to cite an instance in which Mr. Gladstone ever spoke disrespectfully of the present Conservative leader. On the other hand, he has frequently made personal references to that eminent nobleman which have clearly shown that in Mr. Gladstone's case public politics do not mean personal prejudices. I have, however, heard even Mr. Gladstone refer to his Grace the Duke of Argyll in a tone which showed that his mind is not incapable of keen discrimination. I have reason to believe that if we could get into Mr. Gladstone's mental cabinet we should find a good many men marked in plain figures who would be astonished at the price which indicates his degree of admiration. I know one public man who may be had for something less than two-and-ninepence. But wait.

Returning to my catechism, I said: "Who is the greatest Church of England preacher, not including living instances?"

I was not prepared for Mr. Gladstone's reply. He could only answer me with a "perhaps." I expected to hear the name of Newman. The answer was: "In mental power through his sermons, Canon Liddon, perhaps. In command over his congregation Rev. Henry Melville."

The last name surprised me. Yet why? The crowd likes a whirlwind when there is no danger from chimney pots. Some travellers avoid stopping trains. I expected to hear the great name of Newman, because on another occasion I had heard Mr. Gladstone describe him as one of the greatest of Anglican preachers. "At first," said he, "there was perhaps a little disappointment arising from the peculiar monotony of his voice, but as he went from point to point the voice itself became wonderfully solemn and impressive, the effect of the whole being one of great sublimity."

Passing from preachers to statesmen, I wished Mr. Gladstone to give me a comparative estimate of English and Irish capacity in the matter of statesmanship. I soon found, however, that I was on the wrong scent. Mr. Gladstone has a remarkable power of becoming suddenly deaf, so much so as to lead one to inquire, "Who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born deaf?" Ignoring the form of my inquiry, or treating his own form as if it were mine, he said:

"The Irish Tories since the Reform Bill have (in point of capacity and eloquence) been sadly below those of the last century."

Only those who have heard Mr. Gladstone pronounce in public the word "Tories" can have any idea what an amazing polysyllable he makes of it. The two little syllables run into most of a dozen as they fall in comical undulation and expansion from the wizard's lips. Mr. Gladstone seems to see in that harmless-looking word quite a number of things zoological, curious, incongruous, and inconceivable: he smiles suggestively when he utters it, as who should say, "Gentlemen, I am not responsible for the term; I found it in the language; I would avoid it if I could; acquit me, please, of the suspicion of having invented it." Yet Mr. Gladstone likes to pronounce the word

Tories, because its utterance seems to have some connection with momentary recreation and amusement. It is his way of taking a turn at football.

My next question was: "Who was the typical Parliamentary Irishman up to 1860?" I purposely fixed the date so as to avoid invidious references to living men. Mr. Gladstone at once replied: "In my time none but O'Connell on a large scale; Shiel on a smaller one."

I had heard Mr. Gladstone describe Shiel's Parliamentary speaking with great interest. He said that Shiel prepared even the words of his speeches (which Mr. Gladstone himself never does to any extent), and that his delivery, voice, attitude, and facial expression combined to form a Parliamentary picture impossible to forget O'Connell was huge, gigantic, overwhelming. I got the impression that Shiel might sound in relation to O'Connell as a threepenny bit to a half-sovereign. From time to time there have been a good many half-sovereigns in Ireland. It is reported that one of them has been nailed to the counter.

I had another ecclesiastical question to ask: "Is it your opinion, Mr. Gladstone, that the Church of England has a firmer hold upon the people than it ever had?"

Mr. Gladstone saw in a moment that this is an inquiry which has many pigeon-holes in it, and that in one of them there might be a memorandum bearing the ominous words Disestablishment and Disendowment.

"The Church of England," he replied, "suffers much from the general decline of what is called the prestige of Churches but has gained much from the transformation of the clergy."

I then varied the inquiry thus: "Do you think the Church of England pulpit of to-day is equal to its position thirty years ago—in ability, in zeal, in popular sympathy, and theological learning?"

"Too short a term," he replied; "since I was a boy this pulpit has become more liberal and genial, and infinitely more Christian."

This is a noble testimony, and I believe that every Nonconformist observer would gladly re-echo and confirm it. Anglican

earnestness has not been without its effect on Nonconformist activity. Perhaps I have applied too severe a test to the Christian spirit which Mr. Gladstone gratefully recognises, in requiring it to make some fraternal use of the Nonconformist pulpit. Some clergymen have been willing to preach in Nonconformist pulpits, and others have actually done so ; but the Bishops have, to say the least of it, made no sign of approach. I asked Mr. Gladstone's opinion, and I found it was dead against me.

" I do not believe," said he, " in what is known as the interchange of pulpits. With all respect for those clergymen who are willing to preach in Nonconformist pulpits, I must say they do not seem to form a proper conception of their own Church."

This was rather damping to my new zeal, yet so thoroughly honest as to increase admiration for the man who thus encountered my ruthless dissent.

The question as to Mr. Gladstone being a Papist or a Jesuit has often been asked. I know that he is both the one and the other, and that he is so because he cannot help it. Mr. Gladstone is not only a Papist, he is the Pope, and that is the real reason why he has sometimes disputed the nominal Pontiff's primacy. We must be on our guard against the rough and ready summaries of character which ignore psychological necessities. A man is in reality just what he is in his soul. Loyola himself was but a skeleton of a Jesuit compared with Mr. Gladstone. I now use the word Jesuit in its purest sense and application. All the baby tricks of *The Spiritual Exercises* would come with natural ease to Mr. Gladstone. He believes in long lines and short lines, in dots and notches, in orientation and attitude, in religious marchings, in emblematic colours, in fast and vigil and prostration. All these terms are part of his mother tongue. When he hears them he recognises them as having heard them in some pre-natal state. They are older than Homer. They are sterner than the dreams of Dante. But is Mr. Gladstone a member of the Romish Church?

Nothing of the kind. All his assurances on this matter may be received with implicit and absolute confidence. Yet Mr. Gladstone has, I can quite imagine, infinitely more respect for the Sovereign Pontiff than for the Archbishop of Canterbury. He delights, in matters

religious, to be lost in mythic antiquity. His religious thought is majestic rather than tender,—astronomic rather than domestic.

Then, if not a member of the Romish Church, why has he always given a Romish vote in Parliament?

Because he could not help it.

But ought he not to have striven desperately to help it?

Perhaps. But why pit mechanics against gravitation? Gravitation is an awkward opponent, even when it passes under the name of destiny.

Had I been called upon some time ago to say whether Mr. Gladstone was destitute of pathos I should have credited him with that lamentable destitution. I know better now, because I have been an eye-witness of his feeling. During his last Premiership I had the honour of breakfasting with him in Downing Street. After breakfast Mr. Gladstone took down a book and read aloud an account of the circumstances under which Ireland was united to Great Britain. The account was so pathetic that Mr. Gladstone could not proceed. He simply broke down and sobbed like a child.

On this point I may not enlarge; it is introduced to prove that Mr. Gladstone's is a great and sensitive heart.

On the same occasion an incident of another kind occurred. Mr. Gladstone passed round a printed prayer, written by some political opponent, which invoked all degrees of divine displeasure upon him. The prayer was indeed a most energetic direction to the Almighty as to the right method of procedure, especially in the adjustment of British and Irish affairs. The prayer was anonymous, and was intended for adoption morning and evening by the whole adult population of these islands. After the prayer had been silently perused by the company, I asked Mr. Gladstone if he had any suspicion as to its authorship.

"Not the least," said he.

I then told Mr. Gladstone who had written the prayer, and he exclaimed, "I can well believe it, and she would write it with the most perfect sincerity. I am glad," he continued, "to have that piece of intelligence. I well remember her being here on one occasion, and how horrified she was when she found herself sitting side by side with a Romish priest."

One thing is certain: whether Mr. Gladstone lacks humour or pathos, he does not lack appreciation of other men, not even of his staunchest opponents. I remember expressing the wish that John Bright would fall asleep until the Irish question was settled, whereupon Mr. Gladstone instantly added:

"We must think of his great services to the country in other years, and hope the best. He is certainly to be credited with many noble works."

That this magnanimity does not arise from lack of critical force or controversial eagerness all the world is well aware. It may even be said of Mr. Gladstone as it was said by Oliver Goldsmith of Dr. Johnson: "When his gun misses fire he knocks you down with the butt end." This was curiously illustrated in his speech on the Religious Disabilities Removal Bill. He had asserted that the Pope requires every convert to surrender his loyalty and civil duty to Rome. He then said in a tone of almost bitter rebuke that Cardinal Newman and others had assured him that the loyalty of Roman Catholics remained untainted and secure, but he did not add that after receiving those very assurances he proceeded to reaffirm and sustain his original proposition! And when he came to close quarters with what appeared to be a palpable inconsistency, he got out of it, to his own satisfaction, not by mitigating the Papal claim, but simply by defying the Pope to do his worst! Revering Mr. Gladstone as I do, I am yet constrained to remind myself that defiance is not argument. If a man kept a tiger in his house he might defy a burglar, but the burglar would not be one whit the more respectable on that account.

"Do you think," I inquired, "the Liberal party possesses many rising young men?"

To this inquiry there came an instant and emphatic Yes. Then the war-horse stirred within him. Then that strange blue light came into his eyes, as he added:

"Despite the losses of 1886."

After a momentary pause, Mr. Gladstone continued:

"I am no pessimist."

That is the right tone for a leader. Commanders should know

nothing about pessimism. It is the business of a soldier to win. It simply never occurred to Mr. Gladstone that he could lose. Even when electoral returns are against him he can find an element of hope in the indisputable calculation that if half a voter can walk a mile and a quarter along a frosty road and persuade another half-voter to go with him to the poll, "it follows as the night the day" that at the next General Election the Tories will be nowhere. Nothing can daunt him. The whole air is alive with the tremendous action of his sword. Other men grow towards old age; Mr. Gladstone grows towards bounding youthfulness. When life is so definite the relation of other men to it is, not unnaturally, pronounced. No public man has such friends or such enemies as Mr. Gladstone. Yet, at the last, the judgment upon him will not be lacking in nobleness. In controversy Englishmen fight like tigers, and madden themselves into the sort of fury which must express its piety, especially its patriotism, in terms unknown to the Church. But when the fight is over, Englishmen can magnanimously forgive and forget. It is not for me to suggest a policy to so illustrious a statesman, yet, in view of the shameful manner in which he has been treated by some of the Irishmen whose cause he has done so much to advance, I should rejoice to know that he had determined to pass the eventide of his life far from political controversy and tumult, especially as it now lies within his power to do so under circumstances which would not only enhance the dignity of his character, but enable even his most determined antagonists honestly to salute him as the first Soldier of his age.

JOSEPH PARKER.

The City Temple.

A MODEL CITY.

I.—THE WATER SUPPLY.

AMONG the many subjects of London government, or rather of London mis-government, which the neglect of former generations has left in arrear, there is none more important than that of water supply: whether it be regarded from the point of health and sanitary reform, or of comfort and improved civilisation, or of finance. The supply of an ample quantity of pure and wholesome water at a moderate cost is a matter of the first importance to every member of the community, and especially to every member of such a "model city" as we hope that London may be. It is a matter in which each member is concerned, not only for himself, but for his neighbours, for the health of one is the health of all, and one plague-spot rapidly infects a neighbourhood. The supply of water, and the payment for that supply, are and must be conducted largely on Socialist principles.

It is needless, and would be impossible, within the limits of such an article as this, to write the history of the London water supply, or, indeed, to give more than the merest outline of its present condition, more especially since full particulars are contained in many accessible books and papers.*

In order to make what follows intelligible, it will be sufficient to give the following particulars.

---

* See especially the Report of the Duke of Richmond's Commission of 1869; the Report of the Select Committee of 1880 (Parliamentary Paper 329, Session 11); the annual Reports of the Water Examiner, appended to each annual Report of the Local Government Board; the recent Report of the County Purposes Committee to the Court of Common Council of the City; and the recent Report to the London County Council of their Engineer. Most of the information is conveniently summarised in the late Sir F. Bolton's *London Water Supply* (Clowes, 1888).

London and the surrounding districts are supplied by eight companies, of which the chief physical and financial conditions may be gathered from the two following tables :—

TABLE I.

PHYSICAL STATISTICS FOR THE YEAR 1888.

Compiled by the Engineer of the London County Council from Bolton's *London Water Supply*.

Name of Company.	Source of Supply or Intake.	Total volume which may be taken daily.	Average daily supply.	Estimated Population supplied within the districts of the Companies.
		Gallons.	*Gallons.*	
Kent... ...	Chalk Wells	No restriction	11,039,412	421,296
New River ...	Chadwell Spring, River Lea, and 13 Chalk Wells	No restriction	27,812,000	1,123,000
East London	River Lea and Thames at Sunbury, and Chalk Wells and Springs	From Thames 10,000,000, from Lea not restricted	38,842,752	1,202,890
Southwark and Vauxhall	Thames at Hampton	24,500,000	22,881,600	809,557
West Middlesex	Thames at Hampton	24,500,000	13,965,703	524,692
Grand Junction	Thames at Hampton	24,500,000	15,026,047	485,055
Lambeth ...	Thames at Molesey	24,500,000	15,583,900	606,606
Chelsea ...	Thames at Ditton and Molesey	22,000,000	8,873,840	273,483
Totals	From Thames ...	130,000,000*	76,331,090	
	Other sources ...	Not restricted	77,694,164	
			†154,025,254	5,446,572

* The average daily quantity taken from the Thames during the month of June, 1890, was, according to the report of the Official Water Examiner, 97,707,062 gallons.

† According to returns laid before the "Committee for County Purposes of the Court of Common Council" during their recent inquiry on "Water Supply," the average daily supply for the year 1889 is given as 166,942,483 gallons; and, according to the Official Water Examiner, the average daily supply during June, 1890, was 183,376,080 gallons.

TABLE II.

FINANCIAL STATISTICS FOR 1888 AND FOR 1889-90.*

Abstracted from Tables prepared by A. Lass and Co., for Committee of Common Council. See Appendix Tables A and B, and p. lxiv.

Name of Company.	Capital Employed	Total Income.	Total Expenditure.	Net Profit.	Increase of 1888 Dividends over 1877 Dividends.	Estimated Market Value 1889-90.
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Kent	880,173	120,194	39,208	79,807	33,026	2,238,825
New River	3,525,404	465,473	165,466	242,071	42,654	10,933,375
East London... ...	2,352,590	252,990	97,774	132,272	21,818	4,463,269
Southwark & Vauxhall	2,122,694	200,344	87,565	64,916	38,462	3,244,375
West Middlesex ...	1,294,638	203,238	81,122	119,243	25,069	3,244,086
Grand Junction ...	1,513,181	173,035	64,715	97,902	40,497	3,017,937
Lambeth	1,668,693	206,420	74,057	124,804	55,163	3,763,747
Chelsea	1,197,440	124,816	37,934	66,487	27,636	2,538,892
	14,554,813	1,746,510	647,841	927,502	284,325	33,444,506

The following are the figures of capital and market values for three different years, all drawn from the same sources †:—

Year.	Aggregate Nominal Capital.	Average Market price per cent.	Market Value.
	£	£	£
1871	10,016,164	144·51	14,475,096
1883	13,057,377	213·92	27,933,052
1889-90	14,432,733	225·48	33,444,506

It will be noticed how enormous has been the increase in market value as compared with the actual capital.

These companies, whilst subject to certain provisions contained in public general Acts, have each their own special Acts

* The financial year of the first three Companies ends on December 31st, 1888; that of the last five companies ends on March 31st, 1889.

† See Appendix to City Report, pp. lxiv., lxv.

by which their charges are regulated; and these charges, though founded on the same principle, differ considerably in amount and in detail. In all of them the water required for domestic uses is paid for by a rate dependent upon the annual value of the tenement supplied, but the rates vary considerably, and the definitions of what is a domestic purpose, and therefore included in the rate, also differ.

There has been much dispute concerning the meaning of the annual value upon which the water rates are levied, and these disputes have been recently determined by the Act 48 and 49 Vic., cap. 34, which provides that annual value shall mean the ratable value, as determined by the Metropolis Valuation of Property Act, 1869. The effect is that the rates vary with each quinquennial revaluation of London property, and since on the whole the valuations have hitherto been rising, it is a great and reasonable subject of complaint that the companies' rates have been thus made to rise without any additional expense incurred, or service rendered on their part.

Under these circumstances, there are two subjects of paramount importance which call for immediate action. The first of these is the consolidation of the water supply in the hands of one public authority, and the second is the consideration of what are to be the future sources of London water supply. It will be found that these two subjects are intimately connected, and, indeed, that it is impossible to deal adequately with the first until we have come to some conclusion upon the second.

The expediency of placing the water supply of every great town in the hands of its own Council, and of withdrawing it from those of commercial companies, is now so fully admitted that it is hardly worth while to discuss it. The reasons are given at length in the Report of the Commission of 1869: they were endorsed both by the action of the Government and by Sir W. Harcourt's Committee in 1880; and have been acted on by the great provincial towns, most of which are now owners of their water supply.

It is unnecessary for my present purpose to investigate the complaints which are made of the companies, however important they may be when the case for compensation comes to be con-

sidered. The case for vesting water supply in a public authority is complete without such complaints. On financial grounds alone it is obvious that the transfer from the companies to the municipality ought to be no longer delayed. According to the tables above given, the total capital which has been actually expended by the companies has been something less than £15,000,000, whereas the market value of the companies' property according to the Stock Exchange List, is more than double that sum. Now, assuming that the public authority could have managed the undertakings as economically as the companies, and that the water rates in the hands of the public authority were enough and not more than enough to pay for the outlay, it is obvious that the public would, if the undertaking had been in the hands of the public body from the beginning, have been now paying interest upon less than £15,000,000 instead of upon upwards of £30,000,000.

Further, the profits of the companies, or, in other words, the sums which the public thus unnecessarily pay for water, are increasing in a proportion far greater than the capital expended. The dividends appear from the above tables to have increased in the ten years ending with 1888 by nearly £300,000, and if, as has been too often assumed, the money which the public will have to give for the purchase of the undertakings is to be measured by the amount of the dividends, that purchase money will have increased in the ten years ending 1888 by an equivalent capital sum.

Again, whilst the actual capital expended has increased in twenty years by less than £4,500,000, the market value has increased by £19,000,000; and if market value were to be taken as a measure of the purchase money, the purchase money would now be larger by that sum than it would have been in 1871, without any corresponding advantage to the purchasing municipality. It is a case of the Sibylline leaves.

The difficulty of dealing with these great vested interests has hitherto proved insuperable. It was upon this difficulty that Lord Cross's scheme broke down. The principle of that scheme was to give to the shareholders of the companies, in consideration of their existing net income, the value of that net income in immediate annuities in 3½ per cent. London stock, and to add to this payment

deferred annuities to accrue at various intervals, in consideration of anticipated increase of revenue. The figures of that scheme work out as follows*:—

	£
Value of Annuities thus given	29,734,281
Preferential and Debenture Capital	3,061,500
Mortgage and Bond Debt	223,055
	£33,018,836

These terms were rejected as extravagant by the Select Committee, for reasons which are stated at length in their report, and the question has slumbered until it was taken up last year. The London Council have no power to introduce a Bill upon the subject, but they obtained last Session power to spend £5,000 upon inquiries, which they are now prosecuting. The City Corporation have not only instituted the inquiry referred to above, but have introduced a Bill, and certain of the Vestries have also introduced a Bill. The object of the City Bill is to create a new Commission, consisting of fifty-one members, representing the City, the London Council, and the Councils of all the counties and boroughs in the valleys of the Thames and Lea, with powers to negotiate with the water companies, and to promote Bills for establishing a new water supply and for buying up the companies. The Vestries' Bill follows the same lines as the City Bill in establishing a new Water Commission or Water Trust, but differs from the City Bill in confining the representation to the districts supplied by the London water companies, which include more than 1,000,000 of persons living outside the London County area. This Bill also goes beyond the City Bill in imposing upon the new Water Trust the duty of at once buying up the water companies, and provides for the appointment of arbitrators, to whom, in case of dispute, the terms of such purchase are to be referred; but it does not give to the new Trust the power of introducing new sources of supply, nor does it contain any directions to the arbitrators concerning the principles by which their decisions

* See Report of Select Committee 329, Session 2, 1880.

are to be guided. This Bill, it should be observed, contains, apparently by way of compromise, a clause enabling the London County Council, if it so determines before the end of the year, to take upon itself the duty of the Water Trust.

Both these Bills appear to be open to serious objections. At a moment when London and the surrounding districts are struggling to bring into operation a new system of local government, comprising many new organisations with complicated powers, the framers of these Bills propose to add for the special purpose of water supply another new organisation, which is, in some respects, still larger and more complicated than any of them. They propose to bring together, for purposes of common action, representatives of bodies which have little in common, which are geographically and otherwise distinct, and whose interests are different and opposed, and they assume that such representatives will act together in as satisfactory a manner as an ordinary Town Council. Finally, the framers of these Bills propose to commit to the new heterogeneous bodies to be thus constituted one of the most delicate and difficult financial tasks which could be entrusted to any municipal body; that, namely, of negotiating with and purchasing the undertakings of the present water companies. The Bill of the Vestries discloses certain further objections which the more cautious Bill of the City keeps in the background, viz., first, the difficulty and danger of entrusting to any arbitrator the duty of deciding what London shall pay to the companies, more especially when unaccompanied by any directions for the guidance of the arbitrators; and, secondly, the difficulty and probable extravagance of creating a new system of local rating, a new system of local finance, and a new and distinct species of Metropolitan stock, in an area where rating authorities are already too numerous, and where Metropolitan stock holds its place in the market because the wise management of the Metropolitan Board and of Parliament has consolidated, in the form of that one stock, the various debts of the different local authorities. All of these objections are material, but, after all, the one imminent question at the present moment is the acquisition of the undertakings of the water companies, and all schemes that are proposed must be judged according to their prospect of success in dealing with this

question. It is in dealing with this question that the Bills of the present Session, as well as Lord Cross's scheme of 1880, show their greatest weakness.

In general, when a purchaser is about to make a bargain, he inquires carefully what will be the value to him of the thing he is about to buy, what is its actual condition, and at what cost he could provide other means of attaining the same object; and what he is prepared to offer will be measured by the result of these inquiries. Nor will the seller be able to demand a price exceeding the amount thus measured. These are the principles of an ordinary sale or bargain; but they are principles which were wholly neglected in Lord Cross's bargain with the companies, and they appear to have been little, if at all, adverted to in the Bills of the present Session. In the agreement effected in 1880 by Mr. E. J. Smith, it seems to have been assumed, on the one hand, that the purchasing Water Trust would receive and enjoy all the property and income which the companies were receiving; and, on the other, that the companies were entitled absolutely to a complete, permanent and unimpeachable undertaking, rendering to them for ever not only their present income, but an addition to be expected from the growth of population. These assumptions are entirely unfounded. The undertakings in the hands of the purchasing municipality will not be the same thing as the undertakings in the hands of the companies. In the first place, the municipality will be able to effect certain economies by simplifying administration; but it will, on the other hand, be unable to maintain the existing system of water rates in its entirety, and it will have to pay towards a Sinking Fund for the redemption of the debt which it must incur. These, however, are matters which concern the purchaser only, and which he must weigh against the other advantages of the purchase, but which do not affect the vendors or the value of the property as it exists in their hands. But there are, in the second place, other circumstances which affect both the purchaser and the vendor, and which ought to be fully taken into account before any terms of negotiation are proposed. The undertakings of the companies may be divided into two parts, namely:—

1. The machinery of distribution.
2. The source of supply.

The value of the undertaking depends upon the condition of both these parts. If both are sufficient for the purpose, in good working order, and likely to last, the concern is a good going concern, and its value must be determined accordingly. If both or either of them is in such a condition that they require to be replaced or renewed, the value of the concern is diminished by the sum necessary to replace or renew them, and neither can the vendor demand, nor ought the purchaser to give, as much as he would have given if no such replacement or renewal had been necessary.

If, for instance, as would appear to be the case from an answer recently given by Mr. Ritchie,* the machinery of distribution is in some cases deficient by reason of inadequate filtration beds, then the value of the undertakings to a purchaser, and the value which a vendor can demand, must be reduced in proportion to such deficiency ; and, again, if the sources of supply are inadequate for the wants of the immediate future, and if a large sum will shortly be needed to replace them, no ordinary purchaser would give, and no ordinary vendor could demand, as large a price as if they were adequate. Suppose, for instance, that the aggregate value of the whole undertaking, on the assumption that it is a good going concern, and that both sources of supply and machinery of distribution are adequate, to be £30,000,000, a vendor would properly ask, and a purchaser would properly give, that price. But suppose, on the other hand, that either the sources of supply or the machinery of distribution are inadequate, and that it will take £10,000,000 to replace them, an ordinary vendor must reduce his demand, and a purchaser would reduce his offer, by that amount.

Now let us consider how far the fact that the companies have a statutory title, or that the purchase is compulsory, alters the case. Surely not at all, so far as the determination of the value of the undertaking is concerned. If Parliament determines that the purchase ought to be made, Parliament may add its 10 per cent. or other percentage for compulsory purchase, but it will not, because the sale is compulsory, affix to the undertaking a false and artificial

* *Times*, February 13th, 1891.

value. If the London County Council or any other municipal body go in for compulsory purchase they will be neglecting their duty to their constituents if they offer for useless and inadequate sources of supply the same price which they would give for useful and adequate sources of supply, and Parliament would never be so unjust as to saddle their purchase with a condition requiring them to give such a price.

Under such circumstances it is obvious that the first step towards the acquisition of the undertakings of the companies is to examine what is the actual condition of their works, and to see how far they are efficient for the service which they have to perform. As regards the machinery and plant used in distribution a careful investigation will be necessary. We have, as above mentioned, some evidence in the answer given by Mr. Ritchie, and also in the last Report of the Water Examiner,* that the filtration works of some of the companies are deficient. If this should prove to be the case, or if there should prove to be other defects in the machinery for filtration or distribution, due allowance ought to be made for these defects in the price to be paid for the companies, and the ratepayers ought not to be called upon to pay a full price for defective works which, if they purchase, they will have to supplement at their own expense, and which, if they remained in the companies' hands, the companies ought to supplement at theirs.

But it is in the other branch of the companies' undertakings, namely, the sources of supply, that the above considerations are most urgent and most important. At the time of the Agreement of 1880, the last and best opinion on this subject was to be found in the Report of the Duke of Richmond's Commission, issued in June, 1869. That Commission, as is well known, came to the conclusion that the River Thames, supplemented, if necessary, by works for storing the flood waters, together with the River Lea, and the water obtainable from the chalk to the south-east of London and the lower green sand, would furnish supply sufficient for any probable increase of the Metropolitan population. And the whole purport of their Report went to show

* Nineteenth Report of Local Government Board Appendix, p. 243.

that the existing sources of supply were sufficient in quality and quantity. But experience has proved that the Commission of 1869 did not make due allowance for what has proved to be the actual growth of population, and also that they probably over-estimated both the quantity and the quality of the water that might be drawn from the Thames. In their summary of conclusions they say (Par. 261):—

"We are of opinion that a probable increase of population to 4,500,000 or 5,000,000 may have to be provided for, though we believe that the time for such an extended provision will be very remote.

"That 200,000,000 gallons per day is the highest demand that need be reasonably looked forward to for the Metropolitan supply

"That the various companies are prepared, with only moderate additions to their present engineering means, to supply a quantity little short of this amount."

Now, as a matter of fact, the population supplied increased from 3,100,000 in 1867 to 5,500,000 in 1888, and is now increasing at an augmenting ratio, so that the extreme limit contemplated by the Royal Commission as possible at some remote date has been reached in less than twenty years, and is already exceeded.

Further, according to the report made to the London Council by its engineer, it appears that the total average quantity of water taken daily from all sources has increased since 1867 from 98,600,000 gallons to an average for the year of 154,000,000 gallons, and to very much more than 154,000,000 gallons in the summer months, amounting to as much as 185,376,080 gallons in the month of June, 1890, thus approaching rapidly to the 200,000,000 gallons which the Commission looked forward to as the highest future demand.

It further appears that, of the three sources of supply, namely, wells, the river Lea, and the river Thames, the supply from wells is uncertain; the supply from the Lea is exhausted; and the supply from the Thames much nearer exhaustion than the Commissioners anticipated. They thought that a maximum quantity of 110,000,000 gallons a day might safely be withdrawn from the Thames, and

they based this opinion on the hypothesis of a minimum dry weather flow of 350,000,000 gallons a day at Teddington. From the above-mentioned report of the engineer to the London Council, it appears that whilst this may be the case in general, it is not the case in dry seasons. For instance, it appears that the average flow at Teddington in August, 1885, was 210,000,000 gallons a day, falling as low on some days as 166,000,000 gallons, and that the average flow for August, 1887, was 240,000,000 gallons, falling as low on some days as 154,000,000 gallons. From the same report, it appears that the probable out-take of the companies in those months was about 84,000,000 gallons; so that when the river was at its lowest in 1885, the whole outflow, including that out-take, must have been only 250,000,000 gallons, of which the companies must have abstracted 33 per cent.; and in 1887, 238,000,000 gallons, out of which they must have abstracted 35 per cent.; which is a much larger abstraction than the Commissioners contemplated. It is further to be observed that all this water is abstracted from the Thames and the Lea, without any compensation, such as has been required in the case of similar abstractions by provincial towns, and such as those interested in these rivers may very well demand.

It is therefore clear, that if these facts can be proved, of which there seems to be little doubt, not only must the conclusions of the Commissioners be abandoned, but that a new supply must at once be taken in hand.

Nor is a deficiency in quantity the only objection to the present source of supply. The same increase of population which has made the conclusions of the Commission of 1869 untrustworthy concerning quantity has also affected their conclusions as to quality. It is not necessary to make charges of misconduct against the companies, who have done much to remedy defects; nor, in the face of the Government Report, is it desirable to alarm Londoners by suspicions that they are now using unwholesome water. But how grave are the dangers of the future, especially as regards infection, may be judged from the following measured language in the last report of the Government Water Examiner:—

"The fact which renders the water supply of the Metropolis a permanently anxious question is the enormous and continuous increase of the population, not only within the Metropolis itself, but also in the contiguous districts. Each year the customers of the water companies are increased on the average by about 130,000 persons. Not only do these persons represent an additional tax on the resources of the companies, but a certain proportion of them, and a number of others outside the limits of the companies' districts, swell the sources of possible pollution to the rivers and streams, whence by far the larger proportion of the supply is derived. Doubt naturally arises from time to time in regard to the sufficiency of the sources of supply to meet the increasing demand and as to the quality of the water. For a number of years past the condition of the Thames and the Lea and the fitness of these rivers to act as sources of supply of potable water to the Metropolis have been subjects of anxious inquiry and discussion. Draining, as they do, thickly-inhabited areas with a population aggregating above the intakes of the companies about 1,400,000 persons, they are exposed to risk of pollution throughout the whole, but more especially in the lower part, of their course, and the continuous growth of the population tends to increase the difficulties connected with the diversion from them of sewage and refuse matters. Seeing that in the valleys of the Thames and the Lea there are towns, villages, and detached houses, the drainage from which reaches the water courses in a foul or more or less imperfectly purified condition, and that manure is largely used in the fields, it is manifest that the rivers must carry away impurities of animal in addition to those of vegetable origin. This being the case, there exists always the possibility of the introduction of specific matter of a noxious character, and hence the necessity of ceaseless effort in the interests of sanitation within the areas referred to."*

There is therefore ample reason for thinking that the existing sources of supply are, or soon will be, inadequate both in quantity and quality; and, if so, it would be absurd to pay the companies for them as if they were adequate, which we should be doing if it were now proposed, as Lord Cross proposed, to secure to them in perpetuity their present dividends and more. An investigation of the adequacy of the present sources of supply must precede any negotiation for terms of purchase.

But this is not all. Supposing the present works to be proved inadequate, and supposing it to be necessary to supplement them either by storage reservoirs in the upper valley of the Thames or by

* Nineteenth Report of the Local Government Board. Appendix, page 233.

recourse to outlying districts, in the north or west of England, the question will arise, Who is to undertake this great new work? It is possible that the companies may claim to do so, but it is equally clear that any vested interest they may have in their present privileges does not extend to, or include, any such claim. Their vested interest is confined to the statutory powers which have been given them; and their monopoly, such as it is, consists not in any exclusive right to supply London with water, but in the fact that they are in physical possession of the streets, so that to introduce competing mains would be an intolerable nuisance. Small extensions of their powers, such as powers to make new wells or new filtering beds, have been granted by Parliament as comparatively unimportant supplements to their present undertakings. But when it comes to a new and gigantic enterprise, such as the establishment of enormous reservoirs, or extensive gathering grounds, and the construction of aqueducts larger than Rome ever contemplated, Londoners have a right to demand, and Parliament will, no doubt, feel the justice of conceding, that this new enterprise shall be undertaken, managed, and financed in whatever manner may be best for the interest of the consuming public. Adverting to the principles laid down at the beginning of this article, there can be no doubt that their interests will be best provided for if the new undertaking is committed to the hands of a municipal body. And if, in the hands of that municipal body, it proves to be a scheme which competes with those of the companies, the companies will have no right to complain.

The conclusion, therefore, is that if new sources of supply are needed, those sources of supply should be undertaken, and managed, not as a commercial concern by the present companies, but as a public trust by a municipal body.

One difficulty yet remains. Supposing that a municipal body had created, and were in possession of, new and efficient sources of supply, and could bring the water to the neighbourhood of London, their undertaking would still be useless until they were possessed of plant and machinery for distribution: whilst it would be physically difficult and financially wasteful to introduce a new machinery for this purpose alongside of that possessed by the com-

panies. For that machinery they would still have to pay, and for it they ought to pay liberally. But their position for the purpose of effecting this bargain would be a very different thing from what it is now, when both machinery of distribution and sources of supply are in the hands of the companies, and are, however erroneously, supposed to be adequate. Moreover, if sources of supply without machinery for distribution are useless and valueless, machinery of distribution without proper sources of supply would be useless and valueless also : and this is a point which will have to be carefully considered whenever terms of purchase are settled.

Sir W. Harcourt's Committee of 1880, in the concluding paragraphs of their report, clearly pointed to the course thus recommended. After referring to the claims of the companies to back dividends as extravagant, they say :—

"Your Committee must observe that if the contention of the companies is well founded, the population of the Metropolis and its suburbs, amounting to four millions of people, would be left at the mercy of certain trading companies armed with the power of raising the price of one of the first necessities of life to an extent, practically without any limit; a situation from which the companies seem to consider there is no escape, except in the purchase of their undertakings at such a price as they may be willing to accept. If that were the only remedy, the consequences to the consumer of the improvident legislation of the past would be indeed intolerable. But Parliament is not unequal to redress such mischiefs to the public interests. The manner in which the gas companies have been dealt with by Parliament may be referred to in illustration of the methods by which a remedy for such a state of things may be effectually provided *

"Your Committee have not had before them any specific scheme for an independent supply of water, and general speculations on the subject are of little value without detailed plans of the sources from which it is to be derived, and the cost of carrying it into effect. But your Committee would observe that the total cost of the existing water supply to the Metropolis has not much exceeded £12,000,000, a considerable portion of which sum may be attributed to works which have become useless or have been reduplicated. And it would become the duty of the water authority when constituted carefully to consider, with the professional assistance which will be at their disposal, whether a new and better supply could not be obtained

* The gas companies were reduced to terms by the threat of a competing scheme introduced by the City Corporation.

at a cost greatly less than the sum which would have had to be paid under the agreements for the existing supply."

The conclusion to which we are thus led is that the first step to be taken by water reformers is, not to negotiate with the companies upon any such terms as were suggested in 1880, but to press for an investigation into the sufficiency of the present sources of supply, and if these sources prove to be insufficient, to introduce a competing scheme on behalf of the municipality. This is the course which the London County Council have adopted. They have, in pursuance of a unanimous resolution, petitioned the Government to institute a complete, searching, and impartial investigation concerning new sources of supply. They are prepared to assist that investigation by the inquiry they are themselves conducting, and they await the result before attempting negotiations with the companies. In the meantime, they are opposing the two Bills above referred to.

In the above pages I have attempted to give an outline of the present position of the water question, so far as concerns the most important of the issues now involved. It is but an outline, even as regards these issues, for the subject is very large and complicated. There are many subjects which I have not even touched. But all other points are for the moment of secondary importance compared with the two great questions, viz., in what manner can the water supply of London be brought under municipal control? and how is an adequate future supply to be provided?

T. H. FARRER.

ON THE DESIGNING OF COSTUMES FOR THE STAGE.

PERHAPS it would be difficult to find an employment more superficial, if one were casting about in search of such an undesirable thing, than the designing of costumes for the stage. In the decadence of the Roman Empire, when time hung heavy on the hands of many, at all events on the hands of those who wore the royal purple and enjoyed the prærogative of imperial *ennui*, a certain Heliogabalus is said to have spent his time in the collection of cobwebs from the nooks and crannies of his capital, and to have succeeded so well in this engaging hobby that several tons of airy arachnian homes filled many portions of the unused spaces of his palace. This was an uncharacteristic flippancy, and a very un-Roman way of making much ado about nothing. But, unfortunately, it has fallen to the lot of a vast many in this latter age, as De Foe would say, to make equal ado about matters hardly more important ; and that he, too, is one of this class an English public often suggests to the earnest worker in any field of artistic endeavour.

Mr. Kiralfy, at Olympia, arranged for Mr. Barnum his splendid spectacle of *Nero*, which was worthy of serious appreciation. Very few of us have seemed willing to acknowledge to ourselves. however, that this portion of the American show was probably the most thoroughly artistic production of the sort that had ever been seen in England.

A certain admirable journal that we all read commented upon Mr. Kiralfy's spectacle, and Mr. Wilhelm's work in the designing of the costumes at Olympia, only to suggest that, take it all in all, it was almost the equal of Mr. Augustus Harris's greatest successes at Drury Lane. Now, this was a safe remark, considering how much

work Mr. Harris is fortunate in having Mr. Wilhelm do for him, but it was not couched in just the right tone of appreciation ; and if the leaders of light and taste so far fail to note what things are excellent or even good, perhaps we ought not to complain of the unperceptive inattention of the rank and file of the hurried critics of the daily papers. Speaking simply for myself, with that measure of authority in which one who from time to time during several years has designed costumes for successful pieces on the London stage may be permitted to indulge, I cannot help confessing my sympathetic annoyance and surprise that such admirable work as Mr. Wilhelm's on this occasion was received with so little enthusiasm ; one wonders whether the critics always know as a class what they like, or whether the vaguely applauding public would really like to know what should be liked. Stage-costume is an accessory, to be sure, but a necessary one, and, in a piece of pantomimic grouping such as the one in question, quite the most important element of all, after the accurate arrangement of the evolution and the drill. It was not easy to exaggerate the refinement of kaleidoscopic charm in that beautiful production. Its entire reason for existence lay in its power of delighting the eye ; and the main elements of its admirable success in this respect were colour and drapery. In this country of fogs, public-houses, and Strand flower-girls so-called, fine sensations of beauty are too rare to be ignored. It cannot fail, therefore, to be conducive to pessimism to note so entire an absence of proper appreciation of such work. Perhaps it was partly owing to a general feeling that no good can come out of Nazareth ; that whatever was connected with Mr. Barnum's circus must be stamped with a certain vulgarity. But if there were so erroneous and unworthy a notion abroad it was only to be regretted ; leaders of taste whose business it is to search out whatever new thing is good were not thereby absolved from the charge of culpable neglect of their responsibility in a matter which they should have brought to our attention. I dwell at such length upon this subject because it affords a typical instance, in which, on account of its conspicuousness, the point of my criticism may receive such large illustration as to be the more easily intelligible ; and the point, it seems to me, is worth making.

For, although such work as Mr. Wilhelm's in *Nero*, such work as Mr. Abbey's in *La Tosca*, such work as it has fallen to my lot to do in burlesques from time to time, in *The Gondoliers*, or in *Ivanhoe*, or such work as Mrs. Comyns Carr's in *Macbeth* is superficial in the sense of having to do with surfaces and the shows of things, it scarcely can be said to be an unimportant order of work, even from a true artistic standpoint; and it is entered upon, I am convinced, with a sufficiently serious artistic purpose. But always, unfortunately, a number of obstacles intervene between the artist and the goal of his ideal to throw him off the track, and make his work to his own self a series of unsatisfactory compromises.

I remember that on one occasion a girl at one of our best-known theatres was required to wear a modern Greek dress, and that at the dress rehearsal the stage was kept waiting for some time by her non-appearance, when suddenly somebody rushed upon the stage, saying that Miss So-and-so would not under any compulsion appear in what seemed to her, apparently, an indecorous garb, the graceful *fustinella*. The stage-manager, naturally angered, insisted upon the capricious young woman's immediately coming to the footlights, and in her own appropriate costume. When she did indeed appear she was hysterical with tears and protestations that she certainly could not go on in that dress. The stage-manager insisted, and the girl, holding out, was dismissed. When the dress was worn by a substitute, however, who was not so foolishly delicate, it was quite the most attractive costume in the piece, nightly gaining more recognition than any of the others. This little incident that came under my notice will serve slightly to indicate the sort of annoyance which a designer is sure to meet, in multitudinous reduplication, in all his work. This un-classical young woman evidently did not belong to the set of chorus-girls who found so capital an exponent of their state of mind and points of view at a certain other rehearsal in a certain other theatre, in the remark of one of them when told by the musical conductor to "sing up":

"We don't come here, sir, for our voices; our legs are our voices."

Obviously art and propriety are not the only considerations on the English stage. And I recall, as illustrating another kind of worry to

which I have alluded, namely, the difficulty of finding cutters who are competent to follow the designs with sympathy, the remark of a well-known witty-tongued writer, who is still reaping one of the most deserved of his long series of remarkable successes, a remark roared into the ear of an intolerably deaf costumier who had apparently cut out his dresses with the edge of a shovel, without fitting them to anybody or anything in particular:

"You don't hear well, Mr. ——, but it's the best thing you do."

No the way of the designer is indeed hard, if he have a nice artistic sense. For rarely can he count upon the full sympathy of the actor, so that his progress lies not between two easily definable headlands of Scylla and Charybdis, but amid a whole archipelago of distracting complications, constantly impeding his advance and making the issue, as I said, one of compromise.

In reference to his appearance there are three ideals for the actor, and in this triple dilemma he must decide whether he will take the town, or the front row of stalls, or the remnant of intelligent playgoers. It is not always easy to decide. But certainly his best way is the shortest way. He should endeavour to follow the ideas of the designer (which are, of course, open to any proper change if need be), who in turn should have but one single aim, namely, to design in any particular case the most obviously appropriate dress for the part, consistent with the physical characteristics of the person who is to assume it, and then in general to blend the colours so effectively that in every bit of stage grouping there shall be the charm of a striking and original harmony. There are keys of harmony in colour just as in music, and it is evident that an untractable or careless individual in a piece, by some imagined improvement upon his or her dress, in obedience to his or her own whim, may introduce so false a note that the result will be a painful discord vitiating the whole. The only consolation to the designer lies in the hope—in most cases it is the assurance—that the public will not note the fault.

Thus, in most things connected with the stage at present, in England, an artist meets with an insufficient encouragement, although undoubtedly taste is growing. The playwright himself,

the sculptor, and the writer are not the only artists who, in large respects, are left to work out their own salvation. The less important work of the designer of costume is quite as strongly in need of being inspired by the characteristics of artistic courage and conviction as any other more important form of artistic activity. Until Miss Terry wore a rational and appropriate costume as Viola the dresses designed for that part had been singular bits of finically and prettily misplaced energy. And a recollection of the present dresses used in the character of Rosalind will serve to indicate how even the most conscientious artists find themselves compelled to contribute simply to the vanity of actresses who should be above such considerations, and to sacrifice their proper ideals of what would really suit and interpret the part.

But in no department of his work does the costume designer find himself more in need of the courage of his convictions than in burlesques or comic operas. Here more freedom may be had, and even a larger licence, but this very fact entails greater responsibilities and demands more original resource in design. A curious paradox, therefore, arises. Apparently, in proportion as the piece itself to be staged is a work of high literary merit, in which the chief interest is in the unfolding of a notable plot or its success as a character study, does the work of the costume designer become less arduous. For obviously, in the preparation of suitable dresses for an historical play or most of the serious plays of Shakespeare, it is not difficult, with a reasonable eye for tone, to make designs of costumes which shall be redolent in every fold with local colour, and marked in the drapery with the *cachet* of the mode of the epoch. The "legitimate drama" requires of the designer learning and diligence much more than creative originality. In the "legitimate drama" the function of the designer, while it is really as important as ever, is less obtrusive. In a burlesque or in the case of such a piece as *Nero*, the designer becomes a greater good in himself, however, gaining a larger prominence. Here usually there is a greater multiplicity of figures, demanding the expenditure of more thought in the combination of effects of colour and form, and in general there is need of a greater resource. However clever the "business" of the piece, it would be very ineffective without new and brilliant combinations of colour

and fresh exhibitions of fancy in the dresses. The costumes under such circumstances act as a kind of corrupter of the literary taste through the delight they afford the eye, for in many cases they render tolerable, or even very agreeable, what, without them, would instantly be detected as a very poor kind of twaddle or wretched nonsense. In a classical play, however, by the very nature of the case, they can never hope to claim any such prominence; and although Hamlet unclothed in the conventional black might at first be hard to recognise, and although for a time he would be treated as an alien by a perplexed audience, still the tender sonorous beauty and the stately rhythm of his lines would scarcely lose their charm. In the old Globe Theatre of Shakespeare it is not likely that effect depended much on costume, but how a true burlesque of the modern type would have fared at that time it is not easy to see.

An illustration and proof of all this was to be seen not long ago, when Mr. Benson revived at the present Globe Theatre *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. This lovely bit of rioting fancy is in reality a burlesque, and the daintiest burlesque ever written. As such it gives free and large scope for a sympathetic fancy in its interpretation. But it is more than a burlesque. It contains a slender and humorous plot not without the contrast of pathos in which Shakespeare, human as he was, delighted. And behold the point. The piece was mounted and dressed for the most part in conspicuous taste, and whenever the fairies danced in that mysterious greenwood, or Puck, Titania, and Oberon flew among the trees, or the six yokels indulged in the palace of Theseus in their farcical buffoonery, in a word, whenever the main idea was that of burlesque, the audience approved, their eyes being feasted with lovely or appropriately droll costume, and their attention being called away from the glaring insufficiency of the interpretation in some of the main portions of the piece. But when appeal was made by actors frequently unable to pronounce their lines to something besides the merely sensuous delight—to the brain instead of the heart—the costumes were no longer found capable of the trickery they had before effected. All this serves to indicate how important, how much more important than in the serious drama, is the work of the designer in those departments of dramatic art we have been con-

sidering. But it is so important in pantomime, or burlesque, or some forms of opera, just because the stuff of these pieces is brass and in need of burnishing before it can be popularly recognised as a desirable article. Together with the trickery of stage effects, costume in burlesque forms so important a factor as to be almost the main apology for its existence.

To the designer of costume for a serious opera, possessing the characteristics and possibilities of *Ivanhoe* as produced by Mr. Carte, there is offered a larger opportunity still, however. Here the chances are more seriously fascinating; the dangers greater; the conditions of work more complicated; and the duty of self-confidence in the face of an indifferent, unalert, or ignorant public more imperative. The problem is so exacting: it is nothing more or less than the creation of an effect of such positive yet such unobtrusive charm—notwithstanding the thousand and one hampering conditions, archæological, physical, with reference to the individuality of the singer and actor, or those which arise merely from considerations of the management of the scene—that the audience shall feel that the figures are, indeed, living, real; dressed from top to toe in the attire that best expresses their various types. The dress, that is, must both suit the individual interpreters and suit the idea which they are seeking to render as well, besides falling into the proper place in the grouping. For all these fine considerations it is rare enough to meet with proper appreciation. The ordinary playgoer knows only when he thinks he has been offended by something he does not like, but even this not inevitable; and a positive approval, or the reasons for any vague feeling of the sort, he would be at a loss to give.

But although the artist is forced to expect so little reward, he has his own ideal, to which he is bound to cling. In this particular instance of *Ivanhoe*, my duty was the interpretation of a very varied series of romantic and interesting types, belonging, as it happened, to a time of particular beauty and picturesqueness in costume, and affording congenial opportunities. I was required to clothe lay figures, to electrify *silhouettes*, to revive a period. Every detail of every figure was studied with care, and the attempt was then made so to harmonise

the whole as to make the picture in itself complete. At such a time as this arises the chance of serious art. The little figure Wamba in the piece was as closely studied as the conspicuous figure of Richard or Brian de Bois-Guilbert, and in his way he insisted as strongly upon critical recognition. But I imagine, for the most part, that he was overlooked. It will be interesting to know that the mantle worn by Richard, so brilliantly adorned by stars and half-moons in silver, was studied from a mantle worn by Queen Eleanor of Guienne, as represented on the original effigy at Fonté-vraud, in Normandy. And so throughout, the duty was with equal care to revive the period at its best.

And always in such circumstances comes a curious thing, which this particular piece well illustrates. The general effect of the stage picture in *Ivanhoe* is more brilliant, more elaborate, and, with the entire series of accessories of the *mise en scène*, more satisfactory and effectively picturesque than any complete thing in the century itself which it represents. The impression is more real even than the reality ever was; finer than the actual could have been; completer—infinitely completer—than any corresponding scene in the past that is there portrayed. As the castle, the dip of English country, the Saxon hall are all intended to be the best possible castle, the best possible landscape, the best possible temple of wassail and Saxon hospitality; in the same way it was sought so to clothe the Black Knight as to make him the most cavalier of knightly gentlemen; so to adorn the lay figure of the Templar that his robes should be the eminently suitable apparel of the most ardent and fearless of his class; so to clothe the Rebecca, the Rowena, as to make their very robes help to support and preserve for them the ideal of the parts assigned to them; to make the outlaws and archers, in their tawny dress, in which lurks the shadow of the forest, the only possible outlaws and archers in the best of all possible greenwoods. Yet in designing for the stage how difficult it is to secure such fidelity! The vanity of the chorus-girl, eager to display a wealth of hair, leads her to adopt in the wearing of her coif a careless method, which is a continual vexation. And for the purposes of an opera the vizor of the cylindrical, flat-topped helm of the period is quite impossible, so

that to some extent a new and unheard of arrangement had to be invented. Yet the aim is clear, and it is by reason of the certain amount of achievement in the aim that such work lays claim to a seriousness that may be said to give it an interest. I do not know if the feeling which an indifferent public often inspires in the artist's mind, the feeling that they imagine that the dresses simply *grew* on the figures that pass before their vision, is not the feeling after all, which one would like best to cherish; for what, in reality could be more satisfactory on the principles of any true art? Only it is a pain to feel as well that most people would not have known had the dresses *grown* wrongly.

PERCY ANDERSON.

ORGANISATION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY EDUCATION AND THE FREE QUESTION.

ELEMENTARY Education was reintroduced into the political arena by the friends of denominational schools in 1885. Cardinal Manning and others then secured the co-operation of the leaders of the National Society and of the Conservative Government, and a Royal Commission was appointed, as was stated by its chairman, Viscount Cross, with a view to redressing the grievances and improving the position of the voluntary schools.

Their grievances apparently were that they were not still further endowed with public money, that the obligation to make some voluntary contribution to the cost of schools under their exclusive management was not still further relaxed or totally repealed, and that a national system of schools under public management, established by the Act of 1870, was permitted in accordance with the law to extend in cases where denominationalists were also willing to supply schools for the locality. A further claim was put forward by the more reckless partisans of denominationalism that these privately managed schools should be aided by the rates without being subject to the management of the ratepayers.

Experience has shown how imprudent was the action of those who reopened the discussion of our national organisation of the means of education.

Although the Royal Commission was so constituted as to give an enormous preponderance to the opponents of public management; though some of the members nominally connected with the Liberal side, or with Protestant Nonconformity, were known by their preferences and past action to be advocates of the expansion of the denominational system; though the majority was strengthened by the presence of officials and others intimately acquainted with the

details and working of our school system, while the Liberal party was relatively weak in this respect, so that in the discussions of the Commission the debates would be conducted between experts on the one side and amateurs on the other; yet the discussions and evidence succeeded in demonstrating the inferiority of the voluntary schools to the Board schools, the meagreness and inadequacy of our schools as a whole, the wretched condition of many of the school buildings, the breakdown of the pupil teacher system, the inferior training, and in a majority of cases the total want of training, of our teachers; and it was evident that all this inadequacy and inferiority were largely owing to the want of funds of voluntary managers, who tried nevertheless to exclude School Boards from meeting the deficiencies in our system, and to the want of interest in schools which results from making the greater part of our school supply the private possession of ecclesiastics instead of the public interest of the community.

Among the many abuses which follow from delegating to irresponsible and private managers the authority over most of our public school system is the vague and arbitrary power of taxation enjoyed by them through the school fee. The general public is probably not aware that whereas in every Board school the fee is submitted to and approved by the Education Department, in voluntary schools, so long as the average fee does not exceed 9d a week, the managers may demand what they choose, and, moreover, in addition to the fee may charge for books and apparatus.

Before discussing the question of absolutely free schools we may fairly consider, supposing fees to be levied at all in our public elementary schools, what should be the conditions of a fair system.

Clearly the fee should be reasonable, adjusted to the means of the mass of the parents, and should not operate as an impediment to the fullest education of the scholars. It follows from this that in every school aided by the Parliamentary grant the fee, if any, should be subject to the review and approval of the Education Department, and should not be used by the managers either as an unrestrained means of taxation or as the means of getting rid of undesirable scholars.

The fee should also cover the whole course of instruction. It is most undesirable that in addition to the recognised fee there should be other and uncertain charges for books and school material.

Secondly, the fee should not be raised with the standard in which the scholar is being taught.

It is when a child is about eleven or twelve and is in the upper part of the school that the poor parent begins to find that the labour of the child is of money value and is tempted to remove him from school. Clearly the fee should not then be raised, so as to increase his motives for cutting short the education of the child. The Blue-books are full of evidence of the injurious effect of thus raising the charge with the standard. It has been stated by inspectors that sometimes the fee is raised because the employers who manage the school desire to force the children out to work.

This mischievous pressure has sometimes been exercised in small rural School Boards, where the Education Department has sanctioned a fee rising with the standard. In the days of Mr. W. E. Forster's vice-presidency the policy of the Department was strongly opposed to this, but since then there has been a gradual giving way to local pressure; still, the fees in Board schools are as a rule more moderate than in voluntary schools, and are more rarely raised with the standard.

The third proposition in reference to fees, if fees are to be permitted to be levied, is that the managers should not have the power to charge a special fee to any child.

In many voluntary schools the managers charge a fee varying according to the means and status of the parent, and in many Board schools the same liberty seems to have been conceded by the Department. The only practical way of varying the fee so as to avoid the suspicion of injustice seems to be to make a material reduction where more than one child attends the school.

Some schools charge a very high fee to half-timers. This is a device for getting rid of half-timers altogether. In districts where factory half-time does not prevail, the half-timer is a troublesome element and disturbs the organisation of the school. Managers, therefore, by charging 9d., drive him out.

Still worse is the case where a high fee such as 9d. is demanded

for irregular and backward children. It is not surprising that such cases should arise in voluntary schools. Schools which mainly depend on the grant for continued existence, and where the head teacher's salary is largely dependent on the grant, have every inducement to drive out, if they can, unsatisfactory, troublesome, and unprofitable scholars.

No doubt if this power of charging a special fee were used very outrageously, and if a complaint came to the Education Department, action might be taken on the ground that under pretence of charging a special fee the child was being excluded on other than reasonable grounds. But it is idle to suppose that the poor throughout the country know enough or are active enough to make their cry heard as far as Whitehall; and it is well known that much oppression goes on quietly, for which no redress is obtainable. This oppression is the result not merely of the poverty of the voluntary schools, but also of their denominational and private character. To many of the clergy the day school is a necessary accessory to the ecclesiastical machinery of the parish. The correspondence of the ecclesiastical journals and their leading articles prove this abundantly, and those Nonconformists who have to do with the rural districts proclaim that this oppression is not a theoretic grievance or of rare occurrence, but is widespread and a real practical grievance.

Perhaps of all the Royal Commissioners no one showed himself more conservative or a stronger advocate of denominational and voluntary schools than Dr. Rigg. It is, therefore, important to note that at the meeting of the special Wesleyan committee, held in January of this year, to discuss the education question, Dr. Rigg moved the following resolution, which was apparently carried unanimously: "That the experience of the last twenty years has shown that the Conscience Clause has to a considerable extent proved to be ineffectual and unreal as a protection for parents and children against religious intolerance and oppression; that, moreover, in not a few day schools of the Church of England religious intolerance and bigotry of an exceedingly offensive character are, by means of a special catechism, systematically taught the children during the hours set apart for religious instruction, such a catechism as it ought not to be possible to teach in connection with any public school of

the nation ; that the way of appeal for parents against such grievances to the Education Department at Whitehall is difficult, tedious, inconvenient, and often altogether unavailable."

They further resolved : " That all modifications of the national policy in respect to elementary education should be made in view of the ultimate establishment of a complete na tional system of schools under adequate and representative public management. That the committee is prepared to accept any reasonable proposals for free education, but insists that all schools freed by the aid of public grants must be so far placed under public management as (1) to secure the efficiency of the schools, and (2) to prevent their misuse for sectarian purposes." A further resolution, somewhat similar to the last, was passed to this effect : " That no measure will be satisfactory to Wesleyan Methodists which provides for the payment from the Consolidated Fund in lieu of school fees, while it makes no provision for the due representation of the public on the committees of management."

In face of this attitude of the Wesleyans, what hope is there that the Government can take advantage of the popular demand for free schools in order, as Lord Salisbury said at the meeting at the Carlton Club (*Times*, March 21st, 1890), that " they might put the voluntary schools in a position from which no future hostile majority could dislodge them." The Government have been frank enough as to their motives and object. Touching this question Mr. Sidney Herbert, one of their Whips, stated to a constituent at Croydon (*Record*, March 7th, 1890): " The sole object of the Government in taking up this question [of free schools] at all is to save and promote the welfare of the voluntary schools." Mr. Matthew Arnold, in his latest official report, while not in favour of free schools, recommended that the matter should be dealt with by the Government, on the ground that the question was one particularly lending itself to the mischievous declamation and acts of demagogues. Mr. Arnold was right, but he hardly foresaw that the demagogue would appear first of all on the Treasury Bench.

For, if there is any real meaning in the term demagogue as one of moral reproach, it means a man who takes up a popular question with no conviction, but often with absolute disbelief in the

soundness of the cause which he advocates, and does this for the sake of political profit.

Now, if there is one matter more certain than another it is that the great bulk of the Conservative party and its leaders do not believe in the principle of free schools. As long as they were free agents they denounced the principle. Lord Cross, with his majority on the Royal Commission, wrote as follows (p. 200 final report): "If, as we think, provision of the due necessaries of education as well as of the necessaries of life is part of the responsibility incumbent on parents, it may well be believed that public contributions and private benevolence are already doing all that can be safely required of them in augmentation of the payments properly exacted from parents. On the whole, we are of opinion that the balance of advantage is greatly in favour of maintaining the present system, established by the Act of 1870, whereby the parents who can afford it contribute a substantial proportion of the cost of the education of their children in the form of school fees."

No one supposes that the opinions of the Conservative and Church party have changed lately. Every diocesan conference, every gathering of voluntary managers, every utterance in Conservative newspapers, tells the same tale, that the party are adopting a policy they dislike and consider mischievous and demoralising, because they believe that the cry is a popular one, that if they do nothing, in a few years the Liberals will come in and do in a spirit unfriendly to denominationalism what they propose to do in such a manner as to secure increased advantages to denominationalism; in short, that out of the general conflagration of their principles the Conservative party may secure a salvage of pecuniary profit for Church schools.

The truth is that no reform in the management of the voluntary schools is worth looking at which does not secure the transfer of the appointment of the teacher from private and denominational patronage to the elected representatives of the locality. Every public elementary school, at any rate in the rural districts where there is but one school for the community, must become a part of the municipal equipment of the district. At present there is room for compromise in towns and populous places. There, pro-

vided that, as in Scotland, there is a sufficient supply of schools under public management, educational reformers may acquiesce in the concurrent recognition of schools of a private and denominational character. But before we can be considerate of minorities we claim for the majority, that is, the community as a whole, the absolute right of managing and directing the schools to which the children are bound to go.

If the local community as a whole is Anglican the elected School Board will reflect the views of the community. If, as in Wales, the community is not as a rule Anglican, it is a clear hardship that the State should perpetuate by its grants a system of school government which subjects the school to influences adverse to the general sentiment of the community.

But in reality, with a few special exceptions, the mass of the English people do not desire the intrusion of these ecclesiastical differences into the day school. The clamour for distinctive Church teaching, &c., is one that is not raised by themselves, but is raised for them by the clergy. If these had not had the powerful wand of extra rates to conjure with, they never could have raised the support which is now given to denominational schools. The people not managing the schools do not care for the schools, and many of the schools are so bad there is no reason they should care for them. But on the other hand they are assiduously told that if there is a Board school there will be a shilling rate, and it is fear of this, not love of the Church Catechism, which maintains most of the Church schools throughout the country.

Those who do not use the schools, the clergy and the squires, have other reasons for maintaining them.

To many clergymen the Church school means an organist and Sunday-school teacher for nothing. Anyone who reads the advertisements for school teachers will note that in rural districts the schoolmaster is generally required to be the organist and train the choir, and this service, which represents a cost of perhaps £20 a year, is secured by an inclusive salary as head master; and thus the school funds, which by law should be exclusively applied to elementary education, are really diverted to subsidising the Established Church services.

Again, the schoolmaster is in many ways made the assistant of the clergyman. Sometimes he is required to be a lay preacher. It is not necessary to notice the more humiliating services which are said to be sometimes exacted from him. The National Union of Teachers can give plenty of instances where the schoolmaster's position depends not merely on his subordination, but on his servility, to the clergyman. But we may hope that these cases, though they are not unfrequent in the aggregate, yet are rare relatively to the large number of teachers employed. But the dependence of the master who has to teach the whole community on the minister of one denomination is not the only evil resulting from the clericalising of this branch of our municipal organisation. The demand for an organist or a parish clerk, or a general ecclesiastical helper, leads to the postponement of educational to other considerations in the selection of teachers. A good teacher who is not subservient to the clerical needs is liable to be dismissed; a bad teacher who is useful in the Sunday-school or in parish work is likely to be retained. As the mass of the Established clergy belong to the Conservative party, so the village schoolmaster, whose honourable and trusted relation to all the parents should make him keep clear of active politics, may be forced to be a political partisan, to canvass at elections, and generally to take an attitude which must offend a large proportion of the parents of his scholars.

For all these reasons it is of the highest importance that the community and not the clergy should have the appointment of the teacher. But here it should be observed that in any reform of our school system the administrative area should be considerably enlarged. The population of 7,000 indicated in the resolutions passed by the Wesleyans in 1872-3 is probably a minimum for the purpose of securing good administration and getting rid of petty parochialism. Most of those interested in education are agreed that a larger area of local administration than the parish will be required. At the same time there may well be parochial committees of management acting in subordination to the larger local School Board, and thus we shall secure that interest in the school on the part of the parents which will be good for the school and will educate the community.

All these considerations show that the question of the abolition of the school fee cannot be considered satisfactorily without at the same time reconsidering the larger and far more important question of school management.

Advocates of retaining private management, while obtaining a public grant in lieu of fees, say that there is no reason why there should be local representative management because the State as a whole gives increased financial aid. But this objection has no real validity and is merely technical. Public money gives a right to public interference, and if the nation thinks that its interference can best be exercised locally it may well delegate to the whole community through local election that power of administration which a centralised machinery could never effectively use.

For the ratepayers in each parish are the same electorate as those who constitute the House of Commons; they are not foreigners or strangers claiming a right to interfere in what does not concern them. It would be more reasonable to contend the other way, that when we have local representative management the authority of the central Department should be diminished and much more freedom and initiative should be left to the local committees, so as to meet the varying wants of the localities, which may suffer by the uniformity of a system devised in London and applied throughout the kingdom.

A central educational authority is needed, and will always be needed, to keep sluggish districts up to the mark and to secure a high standard of efficiency, but certainly the tendency of the future should be to give more power to the local representatives in managing their own schools.

Having thus far insisted on the proposition that any extension of public aid to our elementary schools must be coupled with a very large extension of public local representative management, including as an absolutely necessary condition the universal establishment of School Boards of sufficient area and the transference to them of the power of appointing and removing teachers, we may now turn to consider what are the essential conditions of any Parliamentary grant in relief of fees so as to make such a grant benefit national education.

After the capitulation of the Conservative party and of the National Society it may be thought unnecessary to argue at all in defence of the abolition of the school fee.

The following are among the advantages of the abolition of school fees :—

(1) The simplification of the work of the teachers, who would be saved the trouble of collecting the pence and keeping the accounts, which in the case of Board schools are troublesome and elaborate. (2) Time and trouble would be saved to School Boards now spent in investigation and determining cases of remission. (3) Attendance would be improved where children had failed to attend part of a week: at present parents who have failed to send their children on Monday and Tuesday are apt to grudge the payment for the rest of the week. (4) Children would be retained in the upper standards, when their education is likely to be of most value and to have the most lasting effect. (5) It might be an advantage to parents to spread the cost of education throughout their whole life instead of concentrating it on the expensive period when they are rearing their children and before the children's earnings help the family income.

But if fees are only abolished in the lowest standard their abolition will be a curse to education instead of a blessing. All the arguments against raising the fee with the standard apply to imposing a fee for the first time in the upper standards. On this point Scotch experience and the opinions of the advocates of voluntary schools concur with the contention of those who support free schools with conviction and not of necessity. So, too, if we are to have the advantages of free schools, we must not have any rags and shreds of the fee system hanging to us when we have divested ourselves of the substance. On the injurious effect of charging for books and school materials there is strong evidence in the United States, and the tendency there, now, is to abolish this charge.

Perhaps it is hardly necessary any longer to argue that any grant in lieu of fees should be based on the averge fee throughout the country, and not on the fee of the particular school. This principle seems to have been accepted in the discussions of the Wesleyan committee, though of all school managers the Wesleyans

will lose most by its application. The *Quarterly* Reviewer also accepts the idea of a uniform grant (p. 183), and says that the attempt to graduate the sum allotted to meet the amount previously paid to the school in fees "would be obviously unstatesmanlike, as it would be giving much to those who needed it least and little to those who most required it." It is a source of satisfaction to find this amount of consensus on one of the practical points necessarily raised in any plan for Parliamentary aid in lieu of fees.

Should it be optional with managers to retain their fees, or to accept the grant? The *Quarterly* Reviewer concludes that if the grant is accepted the school must be freed throughout, but holds it only just to leave it optional with the managers to make the change or to continue to receive fees, "provided one important condition is attended to, and that is that every child should have a free school within reach." The result of this would be, according to the *Quarterly* Reviewer, that most of the village schools would be free, whilst in towns only some schools need be free. We might agree with this proposition slightly modified. In the rural districts practically all the schools would have to be free. In the towns a few of the schools would be permitted to charge fees. This solution would only afford us a temporary resting-place. There are many towns, especially in Lancashire, where, with the exception of the Roman Catholic schools, nearly all the schools would desire to continue to charge fees. In Preston, Burnley, Stockport, and Birkenhead the average fee, including Catholic schools, is 15s. 3d., 16s. 10d., 19s. 2d. 15s. 3d., and if those who want free schools are to have them in these towns the Department will have to judge what schools shall be allowed to retain the fee, what schools shall be made free. It would be very invidious in a town where the demand for free schools would only permit of one school charging a fee for the Department to have to decide whether the high fee'd Church school or Wesleyan school shall go to the wall. Thus, in Stockport, according to the return of the School Attendance Committee for 1890, in the Brentnall-street Wesleyan School 465 scholars out of 904 pay a fee of 6d. and upward. In the Portwood Wesleyan School 337 scholars out of 788 pay 6d. and upward. Mr. Mundella's recent return, Elementary Education, August, 1890, gives for these two Wesleyan

schools an average attendance of 1,468, with an income from fees, excluding books, of £1,639, and for St. Thomas's National School, Stockport, an average attendance of 1,335, with an income from fees of £1,541.

Thus the Wesleyan schools have a fee income apart from books of about £1 2s. 4d. per scholar, the Church school an income of £1 3s. 1d. per scholar; and freeing these schools would imply a loss in the one case of more than 12s., in the other of more than 13s. per scholar, or about £870 in the case of the Church school, and about £880 in the case of the Wesleyans. As the subscriptions to the Church school were only £22 12s. 6d., and to the two Wesleyan schools £3 15s. 6d., it is hard to see if these schools were made free how the deficit of income would be met, and the Department would be very reluctant to adjudicate in such a case. No doubt schools with a low fee, such as 1d. or 2d. per scholar, would be glad of a grant from the Treasury of 10s. a head. But if such a grant be made, these schools can no longer be allowed their present meagre curriculum and inadequate staff, which they have excused on the ground of the poverty of their resources.

We may now sum up our conclusions as to the general principles which should be applied as far as possible in the settlement of this question. Schools receiving this additional grant from the State should accept public representative management to such an extent that the power of appointing and removing the teachers should belong to the representatives of the community. Schools accepting the Government grant must be free throughout, and no charge should be permitted for books, school material, &c. All public elementary schools must be free unless the Education Department expressly sanction a fee to be approved by them, where there is an ample supply of free school accommodation for all who demand it. The Parliamentary grant in lieu of fees should not exceed the average fee collected throughout the country. The Department should require an increased standard of efficiency in premises, staff, and curriculum above the minimum now accepted as sufficient.

E. LYULPH STANLEY.

SHAKESPEARE'S IGNORANCE?

AMONG the curiosities and anachronisms with which the *Winter's Tale* abounds, the puzzling "Coast of Bohemia' has ever exercised critics and commentators. Some have seen in the introduction of Bohemia as a seaboard proof of Shakespeare's lack of culture, of his ignorance, without considering that an error of this kind could hardly escape being brought to his notice when the play was performed, and that it was very easy to rectify. All he had to do, for instance—the suggestion is not new—was simply to substitute Bithynia for Bohemia. Others, again, think the poet was doubtless well aware of the blunder, but chose to leave it uncorrected because in the case of a purely fictitious piece, which deals with the realm of myth and the age of fable, one does not look for strict conformity to fact.

A third group, lastly, foremost among them Simrock, have pointed to *Pandosto, or the Triumph of Time*, a romance of Robert Greene's, as the source whence Shakespeare's *Winter's Tale* was drawn. That very popular story, of which the editions since 1588 form a long series, and which, after the artificial fashion of its day, presents a medley of myth and pastoral romance, begins with the words: "Before Christianity had appeared in the world, there reigned in Bohemia a King called Pandosto." Bohemia, then, was already established in people's minds as the scene of the transaction, having from the outset been designated as such by Greene. Now the opening of any ready-made narrative becomes for the adapter who takes it in hand a standpoint he is loth to shift. It is the part sure to fix itself firmest in the memory of a reader or hearer, and where deviation would threaten most to provoke dispute. This seems a not unlikely reason why Shakespeare, who altered every

proper name that occurs in Greene, may have thought well, nevertheless, to retain that of Bohemia.

But all this fails to solve the problem of the "coast of Bohemia," and merely pushes it a stage further back—from the drama to the romance. Simrock is of opinion that although certain legendary features are interwoven with Greene's story—for example, the exposure and subsequent finding of the child—yet in the main the subject is an invention of his own and does not rest upon tradition. But although we do not know of a traditional foundation, it may nevertheless exist.

Tales of a Romance origin, which before and during Shakespeare's time had an extensive circulation in England, and were the well-spring of numerous dramatic and epic productions, cover a wide field, which is far, as yet, from having been thoroughly explored. Nor has the literature of fiction which grew up in England under this influence been tracked to its ultimate sources. Thus it was not until the accidental discovery of a copy of Greene's *Pandosto*, bearing date 1588, that a long current assumption was dispelled, which had affiliated the story to Shakespeare's play. The circumstance that the most important alteration devised by Shakespeare —the preservation of Hermione (whom Greene kills off in good earnest)—vividly recalls the rescue and recovery of Lucina in the story *Apollonius of Tyre*, whence Shakespeare obtained the plot of his *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, will hardly convert many to the view taken by Simrock, that the poet was at no pains to do more than reproduce in the fate of Hermione that of Lucina. Indeed, if once we stray into the region of speculation, the very fact of a semblance of repetition would favour the idea that here, as elsewhere, Shakespeare's creative fancy yielded to a tradition handed down from some other and older source than Greene. The search for such a remoter source by no means looks a hopeless enterprise, and even slight indications may in some measure serve as finger-posts.

On this account I venture to offer a small contribution towards the solution of the vexed question from which we started. My studies for a recently published volume, *The History of Sugar*, having led me to consult an extremely learned work by R. Röhrichts—*German Pilgrim Journeyings in the Middle Ages*—I

came upon a passage that bears on our geographical dilemma. It is borrowed, the author kindly informs me, from Tschamser's *Annals of the Barefooted Friars of Thann*, and records that "in 1481 fourteen pilgrims returned from their pilgrimage after having been attacked by pirates, from whom in the end they luckily contrived to escape; they had landed 'somewhere about Bohemia' . . . and they kept their promise to the Church of St. Theobald at Thann by a votive offering of 50lb. of beeswax." So here again we find ourselves confronted by the "coast of Bohemia," but are not left in the dark as before, for after the word Bohemia we read in parenthesis, "hereby is meant Apulia." This narrative, all the more telling because the simplicity and preciseness of the chronicle exclude the possibility of confusion or mistake, suggests the inference that there must have been a time, a time, too, not so very distant from the age of Greene and Shakespeare, when the south-eastern seaboard of Italy was known by the name of Bohemia. Now, if we provisionally take the correctness of this inference for granted, and if we try to interpret the "Bohemia" of the *Winter's Tale* and of *Pandosto* by its light, we shall find that the explanation throughout dovetails just as we could wish with the given circumstances.

A favourable wind swiftly bears King Egistus home to Sicily; a storm of two days' duration blows the little craft of Faunia (Perdita) from Bohemia to Sicily; a three-days-long hurricane lands the lovers, who have fled from Sicily, on the Bohemian shore, where they first set foot in a village at some little distance from the capital; Bohemian traders, who travel to Sicily, betray to Egistus the whereabouts of the young couple, and it takes the Royal ambassadors three days to sail from Bohemia to Sicily. It might seem a weak spot in the argument that Dorastus (Florizel), wishing to take refuge in Italy with Faunia (Perdita), deems his purpose thwarted when it turns out they have landed in Apulia. But there is no real discrepancy here. Evidently "Italy" stands for the coast of the peninsula opposite to Sicily and most speedily attainable from it; and in reference to Apulia, moreover, Italy is habitually spoken of as a "foreign country." This stumbling block counts for no more than the embassy to the Isle of Delphos in

quest of the oracle of Apollo. Shakespeare, treading for the most part in the track of Greene, has, in the *Winter's Tale*, taken many a liberty with chronology, and permitted many a strange inaccuracy. For instance, he makes Hermione a daughter of the Emperor of Russia (Greene assigns this descent to the consort of Egistus); he lets the King of Sicily, on behalf of his son, sue for the hand of the Danish Princess Euphrania; he speaks of Giulio Romano as an eminent sculptor. In the same way he did not scruple to introduce the oracle with the ambiguous name. Whether Delphi was meant, or whether it should have been Delos, so much is certain—that the ambassadors, who required three weeks to perform their mission, had a "rare, pleasant, speedy" journey home from Delphos to Bohemia. Finally, when mention is made of the "deserts of Bohemia," when we are told that "places remote enough are in Bohemia," the description well fits the numerous unwooded and barren tracts along the rocky coast of Apulia; while the nearness of Sicily to Apulia tallies with the statement that their rulers had been brought up together as children, and that ever since their reconciliation friendship and peace had reigned between the two countries.

The question still remains to be dealt with, how it was that Apulia came to be spoken of as "Bohemia."* There is no historical evidence of any direct relation between them; for, save that Duke Otto of Bohemia is referred to as having accompanied the Emperor Henry VI. on his progress to Apulia, the two countries have hardly ever been mentioned together. It therefore looks as if Apulia had been called "Bohemia" owing to some confusion or error connected, in all likelihood, with an event or a name of historical significance. In searching for a link of that nature one is led to recall Bohemund I. of Tarentum, one of the most illustrious captains of the first crusade, who founded and bequeathed to his son Bohemund II. the Princedom of Antioch, and who shone forth both to his contemporaries and to after-generations as a pattern of daring heroism. Apulia would almost inevitably in time come to be designated as the "Land of Bohemund,"

* Perhaps also Ariosto, when he alludes to a "Bohemian pilgrim," in *Orlando Furioso* (Canto 28, Strophe 15), thereby means an Apulian pilgrim.

"Terra Bohemundi," and this appellation, or a contraction of it such as "Terra Bohem.," might easily get corrupted into "Terra Bohemica" and "Bohemia"; and thus we arrive at what may not improbably, I think, prove the true origin of the perversion of meaning to which the misnomer is due.

This assumption might perhaps seem far-fetched did it not happen to be reinforced by a remarkable parallel case, the evidence for which Humboldt has put together in his classical work: *A Critical Inquiry into the Historical Development of our Geographical Knowledge of the New World.* He there shows us how the name of Martin Behaim (born at Nuremberg in 1436), the constructor of the famous terrestrial globe, got modified into Martinus Bohemius, or Bohemus, Behaim himself favouring that form because it recalled the home of his ancestry, some of whom were said to have migrated to Nuremberg, from a Bohemian village in the district of Pilsen, several centuries before his birth. Pigafetta and De Barros, who, of course, could have known nothing of these details, speak of him as "Martin de Bohemia," and to this day he is generally so styled in Spain, and Portugal. At a later date, a number of men of science having endeavoured to ascribe the discovery of America to Behaim, or at least to connect it closely with his voyages, we see his name in its distorted shape figure very notably. The Straits of Magellan are christened "Fretum Bohemicum" (Bohemian Straits), and the whole continent is actually designated as "Bohemia," or even as "West Bohemia." Here, then, we meet with a mistake exactly analogous to the one we suppose as having bestowed on Apulia the name of "Bohemia." It suffices for my present purpose to have called attention to these points, and to have made an attempt to account for Shakespeare's hitherto incomprehensible geography, which it is usual to attribute to ignorance.

EDMUND O. VON LIPPMANN
(*of Halle*).

WANTED, A NEW CHARTER.

WHATEVER Radicals and New Unionists may think of Mr. Frederick Greenwood, some of his friends must surely find him an inconvenient champion. In the *Anti-Jacobin*, and in a recent article in the NEW REVIEW on "The Revolt of Labour," he implores both parties to "unite in telling the truth to popular discontent," the truth being that there must be no more "State interference with liberty and property." The appeal comes at an unlucky moment for a party which is busily interfering with the interest on Consols, the rent of Irish land, and the relations between railway capitalists and their workmen. Whatever individual politicians may say, neither party could or would do such a consummately foolish thing as to turn its back on fifty years of municipal Socialism and to close against labour a Statute-book stuffed with legislation in restraint of "liberty and property," to which Tories and Liberals contribute in fairly equal proportions. That stroke, therefore, is "barred." We may not all accept doctrinaire Socialism; sheer doctrinaire anti-Socialism is done for outside the study and the editor's chair. What, therefore, is the remedy for the working man's discontent, which, as Mr. Greenwood seems to see, cannot be suppressed without suppressing Progress itself?

And first, the discontent itself is not new, and there is no way out of the trouble by suggesting that Mr. Burns has suddenly inoculated the masses with a double dose of social sin. Mr. Greenwood has a vision of a "hungry people, as a lion creeping nigher." But the vision is always there, has been there any time this fifty or five hundred years. Want makes it loom larger on the view; plenty, as the working man understands plenty, does not banish it; the advance of physical and economic science only gives it fresh modes

of expression. And we must specially guard against thinking that every garb it assumes vitally alters its substance. Even the new Unionism is not new, so far as it involves a resumption of the work of the old, taken up at the point where the trade revival has given the workers a chance of having a fresh slice at profits. It is only when we examine the same movement, as it embodies the wider economic and moral aims of some of its leaders, that we look for any new phenomenon in the labour world, only to find, perchance, that that again is simply a recurrence of the old—a star that, in the process of the suns, has swum back into our ken.

Thus the federation of union with union has reached a pitch when a general strike of seamen and firemen may involve a simultaneous movement of miners, coal porters, railway men, and the entire body of workers engaged in the carrying trades. This is possibly a new thing, and so is the fading away of the old distinction between skilled and unskilled labour, and so again is the growth of Internationalism, which is especially noticeable in the dockers and the new union of seamen and firemen. So, too, are the programmes of the last Trades Union Congress, of the Dockers' Union, of the railway servants in Scotland, who now demand an eight hours day, secured by Act of Parliament, and the complete nationalisation of the railways. The present leaders of the labour war, though I am not prepared to say that they are abler than the old, no doubt belong to a different school of economic thinking, which does not at all make for barricades, dynamite, and the conventional horrors, but rather denotes the growth of the ordered instinct of democratic self-government. So far as these men merely see that universal Trade Unionism is not the ideal, they are not, as Mr. Greenwood supposes, revolutionists, for Trade Unionism vigorously applied to all industries simply means a perpetual state of industrial war. Their special contribution to the labour movement is that, though they are as keen as their predecessors on all questions of trade organisation, and have conducted most of the fighting strikes since the summer of 1889, they never forget that since 1867 they have had in the voting power of the people on the one hand, and the collective forces of that people organised as a State on the other, the final leverage that they want.

In a word, we have in the new Unionism the ripening seeds of another Chartist movement, which is political as well as social, or rather, social as to its end and political as to its means. Here, no doubt, there is a real, though not an apparent, difference between the old and the new Unionism. The old leaders professed to keep Trade Unionism clear of party politics, though, as a matter of fact they were mostly attached to the Liberals, and, while they constantly appealed to legislation, have in time come to link their movement to a fanciful ideal of self-help. The new, while they sympathise with the political side of Radicalism, have no traditional attachment to either party, and would take benefits from both. In point of fact—and here I approach the main object of my paper—Unionism to-day is largely a reversion to the Unionism of an older growth than that to which I have been referring, and which is in itself the sober child of a singularly sturdy parent. Or to put it simply, the new Unionism, like the old in its inception, though not in its later growth, is Socialistic; but unlike the old, it springs, as Mr. Greenwood correctly says, out of the people's gathering hopes of better things, rather than from the voiceless depths of their despair. It is, like Chartism, a distinctly knife-and-fork, bread-and-butter movement, with a more reassured, more cautious, in every way soberer, economic basis, and a better chance of working the Parliamentary oracle.

And now, leaving Mr. Greenwood, let me go back to the starting point I have chosen.

That Chartism was in its origin and essence a social movement, using political reform as a means rather than an end, precisely as the new Unionists are prepared to use it to-day, no student of its history can doubt. Some of its ablest leaders were largely under the influence of Robert Owen's teaching and personal example, and those among them who were Trade Unionists had a more direct incentive to social reform in their knowledge of the earlier infamies of the factory system, and of the pitiless enforcement of the Poor Law of 1834. Men like Lovett never disguised their conviction that what they wanted was to "probe our social evils to their source"; and the second great petition of 1841 drew attention not simply to currency reform, and what may be called the "faddy"

side of Chartism, but to the "existing monopolies of machinery, of land . . . of the means of travelling and transit . . . all arising from class legislation." Of course, it was this same "class legislation" at which the Chartists directly aimed, and which the six points—manhood suffrage, the ballot, annual Parliaments, payment of members, the abolition of property qualification, and equal electoral districts—only one of which, by the way, has been fully conceded—were designed to cure. But, though there was some confusion as to methods—*e.g.*, on the land question, as to tactics, such as the relations between the Chartists and the Whigs (the new Unionists, by the way, are in precisely the same difficulty), and on other points, no thinking Chartist ever disguised from himself the fact that he desired freer control of the machinery of the State in order to use it for the social emancipation of his class. In a word, the working men of England have in the history of Chartism a real, though, perhaps, not too compact, body of Socialistic opinion, which must needs furnish an apt historical mould for their new ideas of federation and of a common cause for skilled and unskilled labour.

The first Chartist movement died away. Free Trade and the fall of prices killed it. The Factory Acts made England less of an industrial hell for some children and women and for certain classes of skilled and organised workers. Political reform was easily obtained, and the unions were partially protected against the irruptive ferocity of the judges. What did the working man gain? More freedom, cheaper food and clothes, and, above all, after 1870, a chance of culture. Economically, he got little. Rent has risen enormously for the town worker, until to-day the docker must frequently disburse a third or a fourth of his weekly wage for the hire of a couple of rooms. The capitalist had the lion's share of Free Trade, unaccompanied as it was by a drastic reform of taxation, and the worker found himself still a prey to the four abiding evils of his lot—overwork, uncertain employment, an insanitary life, an old age of penury. Nor has he himself developed any substantial remedy for his woes. Co-operation, excellent as a moral and industrial training-ground, has chiefly succeeded as a combination of consumers, and has been left far

behind by private and joint-stock enterprise, and even by municipal ownership. Saving is a mockery to men who save by pence and shillings—and a third of them never save at all, or slip into the paupers' ranks. Meanwhile the capitalist saves by thousands of pounds sterling, and secures his economic future by obtaining command of all the great new enterprises—the labour-saving inventions, the railway extensions, the shipping services, the monopolist syndicates. Profit-sharing, as generally understood in this country, is, I am afraid, often an abuse of words, a trick to stereotype wages, and sweat a new profit out of the workers, while in such a case as that of the London gas-stokers it has been used with the plainly sinister intent of abolishing, or qualifying, the right to strike. Moreover, the working man cannot claim that the State, as a taxing agency, has been particularly kind to him. Within the Free Trade period we have taken not far from £2,000,000,000 sterling in the shape of indirect taxation, the bulk of it out of the pockets of the industrious classes, while the owners of rent and interest have made the most astonishing accumulations in the history of the world, and have escaped with an utterly inadequate public toll. What indirect taxation at its worst means to the poor man is very forcibly shown in a recent number of the *Forum*, by Mr. Shearman, who gives the following table, showing the distribution of income by families in the United States.

FAMILIES.	AVERAGE INCOME.	TOTAL INCOME.
	Dol.	Dol.
180,000	25,000	4,500,000,000
1,200,000	1,250	1,500,000,000
11,620,000	560	6,500,000,000

Now, the 180,000 rich families can save two-thirds of their incomes; the rest cannot save one-fifth of theirs. Therefore the State, clipping 15 per cent. off the expenditure of all these classes, takes 228,000,000dol. from the rich and 960,000,000dol. from the poor. Without applying these calculations too literally to a country where partial Free Trade is the rule, where the Income-tax is a fiscal reality, and where some portion of the rates does eventually fall on rent, it is enough to say that we still raise £50,000,000 a year, or not far from four-fifths of the Imperial revenue alone, from trade and industry;

that, to take a special instance, we still, under Mr. Goschen's scale, tax the very poor man's inferior tea 100 per cent., and the rich man's vastly superior article 11 per cent.; that we make no distinction between earnings and accumulations; that we let off the ground landlord in life, and fail to ease him at death. Yet the mass of these overtaxed workers are toiling at an average yearly wage of £35, and 40 per cent. of those who reach the age of seventy are in the workhouse or in receipt of public relief. The labourer's days, shortened by excessive hours of toil, and by evil conditions of home life, close under the shadow of a social disgrace which our own class instincts do not enable us to realise, but which permanently embitters the lot of the poor. The other day I was in a Norfolk village, one of the most prosperous in the Eastern counties. I got a glowing picture of an Arcadia—high wages, low rent, regular employment. "But how does it all end?" I asked. "Mostly in the poorhouse or on the parish," was the reply. The righteous impatience of working-men leaders at the gloom, the futility, the injustice of this unequal and grievously burdened lot is quickened by sad experience of the limits of mere Unionism, new or old. Thus Mr. Mann, after heroically pulling the dock labourers out of the mire, finds that he has to choose between closing his union books with a snap and suffering the average wage of the docker to sink to something like the old level. The problem therefore is how the worker, having gained a little time to think, a little material for thinking from his newspaper, his club, and his union speeches and lectures, a little prosperity in the better times, and with that a slight draught—God knows how slight—from the cup of life as the leisured classes have always tasted it, is to find a way to keep what he has got and to get more. Like the Alpine climber, he has—with knee-grip and hand-grip and foot-grip and axe-grip—won a foothold. Now he has a mind to go higher and to make his Parliament man help him.

And what kind of help does he want? For even though Parliament cannot give him all he asks for, it is no use offering him reforms which he deliberately sets down as useless. Judging by his votes in his own Labour Parliament, he does not believe in measures for the further distribution of property on its present basis, such as

peasant proprietary or leasehold enfranchisement. These measures every year retire further to the background at the Trades Union Congress. And for obvious reasons. The first proposal is seen to have no practical relation to the farm labourer without capital; the second, while it appeals to a small saving class, who have tasted the pleasures of some form of co-operative life, is equally out of the average worker's scope, and is opposed to his growing sense of the economic injustice involved in the private appropriation of land values. I do not say that he has clearly thought out the alternatives, but, as it happens, his vague social ideals accord with the hard necessities of his lot, and what seems beautiful and just to him as a member of a class also presents itself as the only way out of his personal troubles. He must always be largely a Socialist in the making, vaguely hoping and believing, for he is pushed in this direction by the associative tendencies of life among the poor, by its pathetic helpfulness and mutual dependence, and he is constantly stirred to a remembrance of the incidents of his own lot as a worker by appeals for help from the fighting members of his class, appeals to which he is rarely deaf. Naturally, when he comes to apply his mind to politics his embodied desires easily tend to be collective. He will go for municipalised services, for communal trams or trains, water and gas, parks and people's palaces. He is for human brotherhood as an ideal, and he is quite free to vote a graduated Income-tax as a practical method. In trade matters he is also collective. He goes for "fair" wages, at union rates, if he is a town worker, and for a half-acre communal plot at a "fair" rent if he is an agricultural labourer. He does not care a toss of a coin for what capitalists—not *he*—call "free" contract, for the simple reason that it means for him "blackleg" labour, and therefore cheap, unregulated, and ill-paid labour. As a reasonable being, looking before and after, he sees, as I have already pointed out, that his children can have little better chance in life than he has had, and that the utmost limit of hoarding capacity stored up in his limbs and muscles will go to provide him a decent burying, to save him a very few years' rent for his cottage, and to start his widow with a pound or two in her pocket. We of the professional classes, who know how hard it is to save out of incomes

that are beyond the wildest dreams of the artisan, can guess what margin remains even out of a steady income of £70 or £80 a year, from which the worker has to deduct club and union money—both of the nature of bare insurance against the hourly risks of his lot. Now, however, owing to the franchise and the new instinct for working-class federation, he is able to bring a certain aggregate force to bear on Parliament, and he is, therefore, in excellent train to formulate a demand for a new Charter, and to support it by massed conventions, such as accompanied the old Chartist movement, such as signalise his annual meetings at the Trades Union Congress, and such as he has recently used to enforce his claim to an eight hours day.

And his second inquiry is, "To whom shall I go? Who will open to me a passage to this new life which I covet?" Still, I think, his answer must be: "To the Radical party." Not that the prospect of a revivified democratic programme is at this moment over bright. The year 1890 will be known in working-class history as the period of the capitalist rally, following on the great proletariat revival of 1889. Within our own circles—and I must honestly say through no fault of the party managers—there has been something of a Whig rally. In the course of it the London movement, once the most promising feature of the situation, has largely lost its go and pith, and while it has never been properly worked out as a legislative programme, has died down to a trivial, insincere, and purely mechanical recital of formulæ. Attempts to define and practicalise the promising, though vague, Sheffield programme are taboo at headquarters, and though there are the materials of twenty or thirty good Bills in it, the one poor bit of legislation which has found favour on the front Opposition bench is registration reform, and "One man one vote." No Budget is introduced but a splendid opportunity offers for laying down sound democratic principles of taxation—witness Mr. Goschen's shameful gift of half the Probate Duty to the country landlords—and yet the merest outlines of a people's Budget are wanting, though Mr. Henry Fowler could very well supply them if he chose. Mr. Fowler as a Budget maker suggests Mr. Mundella for an amendment of the Factory Acts, and Mr. John Morley for working-class insurance and the Poor Law; but

Mr. Sydney Buxton and Dr. Hunter have to do these bits of pioneering work. In the Sheffield programme we have opposing principles of government, such as compensation to town leaseholders for unexhausted improvements and the creation of a new class of freeholders, jostling heedlessly against each other, while Mr. Rowlands boldly reintroduces a Leasehold Enfranchisement Bill on the old lines, in flat contradiction of the report of the Town Holdings Committee. In the House of Commons the average Liberal cheerfully supports land purchase in principle and votes against it in detail, declines to allow the Irish peasant to buy his land with the help of British credit, but is willing to let him do it on very much worse terms with his own. This is sheer intellectual muddlement, which will have to be resolved one day, but which I take to be inevitable when parties begin to leave the old ruts for new paths.

But, difficulties or no difficulties, the new path will one day have to be taken, and there is an obvious reason for striking it to-day in the fact that at every recent bye-election—notably at Kennington, at Eccles, and at Hartlepool—the Liberal candidate has found it necessary to link Home Rule with a social programme designed to attract the new voters who failed to come to the poll in 1886. The latest example of the advance of election pledges is Mr. Furness's proposal to reimpose the 4s. Land-tax—in other words, to nationalise £40,000,000, out of our total rental of £200,000,000—so as to provide a pension fund for aged workers, a suggestion, by the way, totally ignored in the London Liberal Press. But even if things were more backward than they are in the Liberal party—and I believe there is progress as a party on fairly concentric lines of political thought—it is clear that there are no corresponding signs of growth among the Tories. There is even a disposition—in which I devoutly pray that the Unionists and all the Whigs we have left us will help them—to take up the tradition of *laissez faire*.* In any case we are in better educational trim than they are. We are at all events bound to democratise politics, and make the working man's vote effectual, and therefore we are in a more favour-

* I must except one brilliant, though isolated, instance in Sir John Gorst's admirable and most suggestive speech at Chatham—a speech full of the best kind of statesmanship, as the two parties, now almost equally dominated by capital, understand statesmanship.

able position for voicing his call for a new Charter. For this I believe the moment is historically ripe, and towards it, as somebody must begin, I offer the following modest "points."

I. The Land for the People.
II. An Eight Hours Day.
III. The Educational Ladder.
IV. A People's Parliament.
V. The Free Commune.
VI. Taxation of the Idlers.
VII. Pensions for the Aged.

Of course, these are phrases. Let me hasten to expand them, premising that, while suggested by the old Charter, they are little more than a crossing of the "t's" and a dotting of the "i's" of the average Liberal's election address, and of the programmes of Metropolitan Radical Federations, London Councils, and the like. Point I. would include allotments at fair rents (the half-acre plot as a beginning), full national control of the land monopolies, such as the railways, with the municipalisation of the local tram and train services, and the regulation of their fares (on the zone system), in the interest of the town worker in his suburban home, and of wages and hours in behalf of the railway employés. Of course, it would cover the municipalisation of land values. The starting point of II. would be the proclamation of a normal working day for State, municipal, and monopoly employés, the extension of the Factory Acts to the men, women, and children employed in the sweated industries, and the cautious adoption of a system of local option in hours for the fully organised trades. The Educational Ladder would begin with free elementary, evening, and continuation schools, coupled with technical instruction, and would lead by the path of scholarships from the Board Schools to the Open University. The People's Parliament involves the payment of its members, and, as a basis, the vote of the adult nation, irrespective of property or residence, guaranteed by the State officials, so as to carry with it a fair representation of the proletariat, who now claim less than one member for a million workers. The Free Commune implies open District and Parish Councils, endowed with their proportion of the

tithe, and with powers of land administration, the effective municipalisation of the services of light and heat and water, the regulation of the liquor traffic, the gradual re-housing of the poor, and the enlargement of the public sources of health and pleasure, much of which could be effected in London, and in most flourishing townships, by taking over yearly the unearned increase of land value. Point VI. may be attained by freeing the people's breakfast-table, and replacing the food taxes by municipal and equalised death duties on real property, and a graduated Income-tax, equitably levied on earned and unearned revenues. Finally, Points V. and VII. would realise the essential idea of the Poor Law, apart from its needlessly debasing elements, and without at once interfering with voluntary thrift, would freely restore to the outworn toiler, in a degree of modest dignity and comfort, the unexpended value of his life's work. And with a view to putting the new machinery into motion, let us by all means create out of the chaos of authorities —Home Secretaries, Boards of Trade, Factory Inspectors, and the rest—which now have the labour problem in hand, a regular Ministry of Labour.

Within these lines, as many of us think, lies a very day-spring of hope for the masses, whose lot, subject to small and fleeting ameliorations, is permanently depressed by the excessive claims of rent and interest. As for a new Charter, this paper is fruitless if it does not emphasise the ease with which useful advances can be made, if only they are in the right direction. If working men cannot get all, they will take a part. They will avail themselves of Mr. Morley's and Mr. Haldane's progressive leanings, of Mr. Schnadhorst's friendliness to labour representation, and their leaders will help to give scientific form to the growth of "social compunction" wherever it is to be found. Provided they are fairly and honestly met—if statesmen will go down to them, learn of them, share their crosses, mould their dim aspirations into a definite synthesis, work for them, and finally *lead* them—they will not be ungenerous; contrariwise, they are bound to play Miching Mallecho with Liberalism. And I suggest that it will be better for the Liberal party to begin this work of lifting the burden of life from the toilers to-day—to let it govern them as fixed principle, instead of allowing

it to sting them as vague impulse—to begin Bill-making, programme-building—anything—*now*—than to put it all off to a more convenient season, when they will most assuredly find the workers savagely distrustful or permanently alienated. For, as Mazzini told the Opportunists of his day, what humanity wants is first a principle and then a way to incarnate it in action—for us to practise our ideals as Faith until we realise them as Love.

H. W. MASSINGHAM.

MISTAKEN LABOUR LEGISLATION.

IN labour legislation fault has begotten fault. If Edward III. and his Council had not promulgated the decree which Parliament subsequently endorsed and enacted as a statute, namely, the Statute of Labourers, we should never have had the Statute of Apprentices in the early reign of Queen Elizabeth (5 Eliz., cap. 4). If those Acts, and other Acts of a like kind, had never been passed, it is very doubtful whether we should have had to-day what is called the "labour problem," a question so mixed in its elements, and so vexatious in its surroundings, that statesmen and philanthropists alike dread to touch it more than any other. Nor is it surprising that it should be so. The interests involved are so vast and varied that measures like the Irish Church Act, the Irish Land Act, and other far-reaching attempts at what is called heroic legislation, pale into insignificance by the side of the diversified complications which surround the labour question. This fact is soon impressed upon the minds of those who really study the subject, simple as it appears to those who have only touched its fringe and then imagine that they know all about it.

Of course, it does not follow that the matter is incapable of solution. Remedies are proposed from time to time, some of a drastic kind, others tentative in their character. The political quack is ever ready with his universal panacea for all the ills that industrial flesh is heir to, warranted to cure all sorts of diseases, from the top to the bottom, or *vice versâ*, of the social scale. Some of the "remedies" proposed would certainly produce stupendous effects, whether by curing or killing is quite another matter. "Clutching Capital by the throat" is one of the methods suggested: to what extent it would, or could, change the condition of things for the

better is open to doubt. The "abolition of capitalists" is a milder form of treatment, on the same lines, but how it is to be effected is not quite clear. Doubtless there are clever surgical operators who believe that they can do it most effectually, but their modes and their instruments are kept a profound secret from the vulgar.

The absorption by the "State of all the means and methods of production and distribution" is the more philosophical way of attaining the same end, or, at least, it has this advantage over the others, of being put in a less objectionable form and manner. It is proposed to achieve this object "by taxing property step by step up to its full value of 20s. in the pound, beginning with the land." Then that the State shall be the sole possessor, the sole employer, and the sole distributor of all the products of labour, of the soil, and of all manufacturing industry. The two former methods are but the crude proposals of the scouts of the coming revolution, of the men who at street corners seek to prepare the masses and familiarise the public with the nature of the possible change which is approaching, if not already begun, in this country, and other parts of the world. The latter is the form in which the philosophic thinkers who are to direct the whirlwind and ride upon the storm propound their theories for the regeneration of this degenerate world. There is, indeed, something supremely fascinating in those proposals. They quite reverse the present order of things, which is: For he that hath, to him shall be given, and he that hath not, from him shall be taken even that which he hath. The "have nots" are to be provided for with abundance, and the rich are to be sent empty away. The prospect here shadowed forth is so delightful that a man having no worldly goods to bestow begins to feel that the sharing process has already commenced, and in the fulness of his heart he prepares to be generous with the share which, in prospective, is about to fall to his lot. It is perfectly wonderful sometimes how ideas will feed the hungry; after a meeting of unemployed on Clerkenwell Green, or in Hyde Park, where they have been enjoying the feast of reason and flow of soul set forth in such a repast of promises, the men seem to return home as well satisfied as if they had been provided with Punch's favourite top-coat for a cold night,

namely, a rich juicy rump steak and two glasses of hot brandy and water. Whether the former is as lasting as the latter is another question.

Supposing, for the sake of argument, that the foregoing proposals constituted rightful remedies, surely it ought to strike both the advocates and the listeners that some little time must elapse ere the full measure of satisfaction could be given all round, and a cure for all the social evils of past centuries could be permanently effected. Even so small a thing as the entire land of the country could not be taken over by the State in a day, supposing that the Act for its "restoration" was passed *nem. con.* The transfer of all other property, manufacturing, trading, and commercial, would take time. The organisation of industry upon the new lines would require a little thought, some care, and management, or else a square man might be put in a round hole, much to his amazement and discomfiture. We might have an example of Mark Twain's experiences as an editor, of a man being put to edit an agricultural gazette when all his previous knowledge and training did not extend beyond what was requisite to fit him for the editorship of a tailors' chronicle. Even in the higgledy-piggledy sort of world we find ourselves in now there is a crude sense of fitness, however defective it might be in certain cases. Have we any absolute guarantee that supreme fitness would rule the roost under the proposed *régime* of State regulation and State control ?

In so far as the evils which attend the present conditions of labour result from legislation they may be remedied by legislation. But some of the things complained of are scarcely remediable in this way. Legislation cannot convert poor struggling humanity from a debased state, supposing it to be so, to a higher and nobler existence. It might remove obstacles out of the way in some cases. It might even make the paths of vice more difficult, and the path of virtue more easy ; it certainly has the power to punish crime and reward merit. Laws, like every other human agency, will succeed or fail just in proportion as they attempt, wisely and well, what is reasonable and practicable. These conditions, poor and petty as they seem, have to be taken into account as well as the higher attributes of truth and justice. Perjury is a crime in law, as

well as a degrading moral offence; yet few will be bold enough to assert that cases in our law courts are conducted in such a manner as to be altogether and absolutely free from perjury. It is deplorable to have to make such an admission, but, alas! it is undeniable. Of course there are, and perhaps always will be, differences of opinion as to the rightful domain and limits of positive law. Some are in favour of stretching it this way and others that; but men of wide experience rather shrink as a rule from its extension. Better bear the ills we have than fly to others we know not of, is their doctrine, and in general it is the safe doctrine. This will be denounced possibly as mere *laissez faire*, but the principle stated is a sound one in itself, by whatever name it may be stigmatised by the new school, who want the State to do everything, the individual nothing.

The fault in connection with labour legislation, as in most other matters, is the eternal meddling with matters outside the domain of law. It is this that has brought us to the state in which we find ourselves at the present time. Nearly every demand which is now made for law is the result of conditions created by law. Legislation interfered, in the first place, between capital and labour, on the plea that it was for the "public good," but the interference was in favour of capital as against labour. The interests of the latter were not considered. That one false step necessitated other false steps, and so legislation went merrily on, from 1350 to the end of the last century, a period of about four hundred and fifty years. Not content with statutory regulation and control hampering labour, Parliament made it a crime, punishable by penal consequences, if workmen sought mutually to regulate their own labour, in their own way, for their own benefit. Nominally this legislation was said to be equal for employers and employed, applying to both; but practically the former were not touched in any way by such laws, while the latter were, and that most disastrously. In one form or another, the laws adverse to workmen continued to operate for five centuries, until a condition of things was created which could not be altered, except by degrees, in piecemeal fashion, so interwoven was the system thus created with the social, industrial, trading, and commercial life of the country. The influence of such

legislation was everywhere, seen and unseen, always operating adversely to the interests of labour.

During the whole of the present century the energies of the "Friends of Labour" have been devoted mainly to the undoing of past legislation, by repealing laws which had well-nigh crushed out the vitality and self-reliant energy of British workmen. This work of undoing the mischievous effects of the past began in 1824, since which date we have been gradually sweeping away the pestilent stuff which filled huge volumes of the Statutes at Large, beginning with the middle of the fourteenth century, and continuing to the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century. It was not possible to wipe out the terrible wrongs of several centuries at one fell swoop, scarcely practicable perhaps to have repealed all at once the mass of statutes which had been enacted and accumulated. And so some of them remained, with all their pernicious effects, for another half a century, to eat, like a canker-worm, into the industrial system of this country.

One great mistake has always been the tardy way in which disabling legislation has been removed, and enabling legislation substituted in its stead. The wise men who have constituted the Cabinets of Governments which have hitherto dealt with these questions seem always to have asked themselves, How much are we bound to concede, how little can we manage to give, just to allay present discontent? Even so late as 1871 the Trade Union Act of that year could not be carried without tacking on thereto its twin brother, or sister, the Criminal Law Amendment Act, which, in its turn, had, together with other Acts, to be repealed in 1875. The Statute-book is not yet quite free from this old-fashioned noisome class legislation, although it is being purged of it Session after Session by the activity of more enlightened men. Some of the "new leaders" are appealing to such past legislation in support of their own nostrums of to-day. They say, in effect: See how capital legislated for labour in the past. It is our turn now. We have the votes —we can turn the ballot-boxes to account. We will legislate against capital, as capital legislated against labour. And so on, as reported speeches show. Truly, wisdom is known of her children; these, however, are not of her kith and kin; malice is not of her progeny.

Another grave mistake has been the avoidance as far as possible of the real issues, as between employers and employed. There has been a persistent attempt to keep up a difference, where none really exists. It is a manifestation of the old spirit, if in a somewhat altered form. What an employer may do, by himself or in combination with other employers, the workmen have an equal right to do, either singly or in combination. Such differences as exist in this respect are the creation of law; by law they can be abolished. Partially the difference has been abolished, but not wholly. For centuries a breach of contract committed by a workman was a criminal offence, punishable by imprisonment, without the option of a fine, especially if committed by a workman in combination, that is to say, if a member of a trade union. In the case of employers it was a civil offence only, the offender being liable to pay pecuniary damages; but even these could seldom be obtained in a court of law. The old conception of law has recently found an interpreter and expositor in the person of the Recorder of Plymouth. But his view can scarcely be upheld in the teeth of other decisions by judges of eminence, having a large experience, and of recognised legal ability. This recent decision, after all, only expresses openly what is generally felt as regards labour organisations, so difficult is it to root out prejudices of long standing.

The ground is, however, clearing somewhat. Issues are before the country which require to be faced with firmness, prudence, and determination. The question is whether we shall go back to the old order of things—State regulation and control—or complete the work in which we have been so long engaged, namely in placing employers and employed upon an equal footing before the law, with favour towards none, with justice to all, as we are able to see the light. The chief province of law is to ensure liberty for all, and give protection to all. Individual liberty and protection are the right of all; and the property and belongings of the individual have an equal claim to protection and security. No matter under what name or plea, any interference with personal rights and liberty must be resisted. Wrongs only are matters for State interference. If wrong be done, by rich or strong, the State must see that the wronged are righted. Within these lines there is

scope enough for remedial legislation of a far-reaching kind, Socialistic and otherwise; but the principles upon which such legislation is proposed or promoted should be clearly definable. The mistakes of the past must be avoided, or the nation will be landed in a quagmire from which escape might be impossible.

The portion of the industrial cycle through which we have been passing recently finds no exact counterpart in the past, but certain periods in our history resemble it. Appeals to the law were frequent towards the close of the last century, appeals against the law in the early portion of the present century. Later on we had threats of universal strikes and of international alliances; gigantic federations were started, and enormous demonstrations were organised. We had also the Socialistic fever, only in another and a milder form. Robert Owen's scheme attracted the poor and the wealthy, the peasant and the prince—even monarchs did not disdain to listen and be interested. Bronterre O'Brien, too, had his scheme of the wilder sort, such as we hear now. Since that date various movements have sprung up, have had their day, and disappeared. The two movements which have held their own and have spread in all directions are Trade Unionism and Co-operation. Their influences have been immense, and to them, above all others, may be traced the real improvement in the condition of the masses which, in spite of all contradiction, has taken place within the last forty years. Legislation may do something, much, in fact, towards putting down abuses in the industrial system, such as truck, sweating, and the like; and also in improving the conditions of labour as regards safety, sanitation, and in other ways; but self-help and self-reliance are the only true means whereby the masses can be lifted up to a higher standard of living and a nobler life.

GEORGE HOWELL.

FOLIOS AND FOOTLIGHTS.

EVERYONE who loves Thackeray longs for a complete and authentic biography of the man who wrote the finest English prose style of this century. But the sands of the generation who knew him are running out, and I fear we shall not be enriched by this work unless Mrs. Ritchie should consent to break the strange ordinance which forbids his family to tell us the whole story, though they help strangers to devise unsatisfying fragments. There can be nothing very portentous to divulge—no illumination of Carlyle's curious dread of "strange explosions" in Thackeray's history—no grave issue between his personal life and the society of which he wrote. We already know much of the gold and the alloy in his character, the beautiful spirit which shines through the Brookfield Letters, the large charity and sympathy for the toilers around him, the cynical tolerance which made him an enigma to impetuous natures like Charlotte Brontë's, the bitterness that was born of a long struggle for fame and of domestic sorrow, the humour that recalls the significant lines of Hood:

> There is no note attuned to mirth
> But has its chord in melancholy.

A Life Thackeray. By Herman Merivale and F. T. Marzials. (Walter Scott.)

I say we have a partial picture of Thackeray in most of his moods, a picture which draws no little of its colour from the brush which Mr. Herman Merivale and Mr. Frank Marzials have wielded together. This new Life of Thackeray is, no doubt, an exasperating thing, because it breaks off at the most interesting moments and fills the mind with half-lights and perplexing shadows. But I suspect that if we knew everything that could possibly be made clear, our estimate of Thackeray would not

greatly differ from Carlyle's—"a big, fierce, hungry, weeping man," with a repressed passion and religion under the crust of cynicism, with small foibles of pride and cold reserve that deceived so many, and the tenderness of heart that was revealed to few.

I think you said you disliked Mr. Merivale's share in this little book because he was so confidential and colloquial. Well, to me it is just that particular method which enhances the value of the new glimpses of Thackeray. Mr. Merivale does his best to enter into Thackeray's spirit, and to give us little details in the master's manner. I get the same amusement from this as I do from the letter which the schoolboy Thackeray wrote to his mother, in which he remarks: "St. James's Park is a very fine place. St. Paul's Church, too, I like very much. It is a finer place than I expected." I would give a good deal to read the comments which Thackeray *maximus* would have made on this marvellous show of knowledge on the part of Thackeray *minimus*, had he written his autobiography. The youngster who patronised St. Paul's would have been a theme of endless joy to the kind-hearted giant who could never see a schoolboy without wanting to give him a sovereign. Don't you see that the solemn airs of the biographer have nothing in common with such a man? He was no trifler, but he had an amazing gift of suggesting serious things under a playful guise. It seems to have cost some intelligent people no little trouble to understand this when he was at the outset of his great work. "It began dull, I thought," said Edward Fitzgerald of *Vanity Fair*. The excellent Harriet Martineau "could not read it for disgust." Poor thing! St. Paul's was not such a fine place as she expected. Vanity Fair was full of puzzling crowds, in which the good and bad seemed almost inextricably mixed. Here was a picture of life, and not a conventional assortment of the sheep and the goats. Thackeray was not a realist, as we understand the term now, and some zealous painters of human nature to-day smile at his sentiment, and the simplicity of his characterisation. But though he is excelled in the subtlety of analysis, he drew the life and manners around him with masterly skill; the people in his pages speak to us with no false or wavering note, and the manifold beauties of his style alone have

made him an imperishable monument. When I open a volume of Thackeray at random and see the marvels he achieved with that instrument of prose—the perfect grace, the noble eloquence, the exquisite shading of humour and sentiment, the arm-in-arm intimacy with the subject which never lost distinction, the beauties of phrase and cadence spread in such lavish profusion—I want to give one big cheer, and then sit down in wonder and despair.

Ballads. By R. L. Stevenson. (Chatto and Windus.)

Well, here is another stylist, whose graces are pleasant to the memory, and who is studying nature amongst primitive Polynesians. I suppose the realist shakes his head over these ballads of Mr. Stevenson's, and wonders what can possess a man of genius to bask in the soft air of the Southern seas in a very light garment, with a chaplet of flowers on his head, weaving into verse the legends of the islands. What is literature to gain from these musings of perpetual exile in Samoa? I don't think these ballads are technically faultless. Much worse is the occasional suggestion of bathos in such a couplet, for example, as this :—

> Love, love, beloved Rua, love levels all degrees;
> And the well-tattooed Taheia clings panting to your knees.

No doubt tattooing is the mark of high distinction amongst the Polynesians, like a long pedigree in Europe, but it is not impressive in a ballad, and it reminds me of Mr. Gilbert and the irreverent muse of the Savoy. Yet there are vivid touches of Mr. Stevenson's peculiar gift in these poems, and he makes the feast of the cannibals, and the escape of Rahero from the burning house where his kinsfolk have been immolated, very weird and gruesome. But all the traditions of Polynesia, even were they told in perfect verse, would not add much to our stock of ideas, and Rahero, who steals a savage woman to rear his dusky race, is a poor substitute for Alan Breck.

The Light of the World. By Sir Edwin Arnold. (Longmans.)

Take another poet for the sake of violent contrast. If fluency be the outward and visible sign of poetic genius, then is Sir Edwin Arnold as great as Mr. Lewis Morris. You may consider Sir Edwin's new poem from two points of view. Its religious spirit is as irreproachable as that of Archdeacon Farrar's *Life of Christ.*

The eloquent divine may be a little commonplace, and his flowers of rhetoric may bloom in rather a shallow soil. But the purpose of his biography is most praiseworthy. It satisfies the requirements of the best family reading, and I can strongly commend Sir Edwin Arnold's book for the same admirable reason. On the whole, I greatly prefer it as a romantic paraphrase of the Gospel story to an American novel of the passionate loves of Lazarus and the High Priest's daughter, which was written by a Boston lady who has denounced the impropriety of evening dress for women. There is, of course, another standard of criticism which is generally too obtrusive. It may be said that much of Sir Edwin Arnold's blank verse is of that order which can be spun by the yard. The woman who married seven brothers is not very poetic in lines like these :—

> The second brother took her ; and, again
> Dying, the third ; and so the fourth, and fifth,
> Down to the seventh. Last the woman dies,
> Childless by all—of all the equal spouse.

Pages of this are apt to pall on the critic who asserts his miserable canons of poetry when he ought to remember that the spirit of the author is as pious as that of *Paradise Lost*.

But now for a realist who has no great spiritual purpose. The terrible Ibsen refuses to be exorcised by Mr. Clement Scott and Mr. Robert Buchanan. He invades our theatres, and frightens all the conventions from their propriety. Two of his dramas have been played recently, and even a champion of good old English melodrama like Mr. Wilson Barrett is about to try his fortune with *The Pillars of Society*. *Hedda Gabler* has been the theme of much excited rhetoric, and *Rosmersholm* is likely to provoke even greater heat. Both the praise and dispraise are a great deal overdone Ibsen is not a great social reformer. His problems do not go to the root of the fabric. He can be conventional and melodramatic when the limitations of his works demand it. But he proceeds on the simple principle of letting his characters make the play, and carry it to a logical end. Given a being like Hedda, and the story follows in natural sequence. The originality is not so much in the woman—for there are people

Hedda Gabler. By Henrik Ibsen. Translated by Edmund Gosse. (W. Heinemann.)

quite as singular in your well-bred, highly respectable English drama—but in the effect of her acts. She is the centre and motive power; they are merely used to enable virtue to score off villainy. Hedda within her limits is an actual, credible force; the other strange creatures are only puppets. Rebecca West, who lives the "emancipated" life, is quite as real as Eustacia Vye in Mr. Hardy's novel, and drowns herself with equally good reason. Moreover, Ibsen does not always deal with morbid personalities. Some of his plays are simply pictures of Norwegian life and politics, painted with a certain Dutch fidelity, not very wonderful in their views of human nature, but all governed by this great dramatic principle of making story depend upon character. It is no answer to this to say that *Hedda Gabler* is not literature, that its personages are vulgar or vicious, that the story is nauseous and the moral reprehensible. I cannot say I read it with undiluted pleasure, or that I think *Rosmersholm* a light and sparkling entertainment for an afternoon, or that the performance of this play at the Vaudeville did justice to its strange psychology. But this has nothing to do with the method of playwriting. Let our dramatists observe life with Ibsen's keenness, and make their characters at least as plausible as his, and their plays may be somewhat less romantic, but a good deal more truthful. As for the critics I think some of them might take the trouble to remember that there is no one in the drama so morbid as Hamlet, nor so vigorously nauseous as Iago.

Rosmersholm. By Henrik Ibsen. Translated by Charles Archer. (Walter Scott.)

I suppose Sir George Chetwynd should be called a realist too. He is the Ibsen of the Turf. You may search these volumes without finding a hint of deliberate romance. But there are countless stories of the betting-ring and the racecourse and the card-table. and I am willing to believe that they are all scrupulously accurate, Indeed, I feel abashed before Sir George Chetwynd's knowledge, and his assumption that, in any given company, talk about racing is most interesting to the greatest number. There is a fine utilitarian philosophy in this, for, no doubt, the conversation of the greatest number does them the greatest good. Who would venture to introduce any topic of literature or art into such a circle? I fancy myself sitting speechless amidst the whirl of anecdote about horseflesh and jockeys and wagers. Nay, I apologise to Sir

Racing Reminiscences. By Sir George Chetwynd. (Longmans.)

George for introducing him into the very dull society of novelists, dramatists, and poets. Perhaps Mr. Montagu Williams may feel more at home, and so I greet him respectfully, and regret that I cannot dally with his worship's entertaining book.

Later Leaves. By Montagu Williams, Q.C. (Macmillan and Co.)

In a lecture which you will find in the admirable volume of the Guild and School of Handicraft, Mr. Holman Hunt complains that, dressed in "a funereal series of funnily-shaped patterns of cloth, gentlemen have the effrontery to stand up and congratulate their hearers upon the great advance of taste in this country." It is nothing to the effrontery which extols the perfections of the average modern play as tributes to the moral beauty of English domestic life. The monotony of those "patterns of cloth" is not so deadly as the monotony of the patterns of what is called the wholesome drama. Nor are they more "funnily-shaped" than *Woodbarrow Farm*, for instance, which is about as rational as the Gaiety burlesque. It is curious that in the art which makes the widest appeal it is forbidden to plant a few new ideas, because that excellent market-gardener, Mr. Clement Scott, says they are unwholesome. They peep forth now and then like timid crocuses, and you may see a few of them in *The Dancing Girl* at the Haymarket. There is a good deal that is purely conventional in Mr. H. A. Jones's play, but in Drusilla Ives he has had the courage to draw boldly and consistently from life; and that is so notable an achievement on our stage that I am ready to swear by Mr. Jones. If Drusilla is not to your mind, and if you want the romantic business pure and simple, you had better take it in the form of opera. *Ivanhoe*, with Sir Arthur Sullivan as presiding genius, is very tolerable, and you may even find the storming of Torquilstone quite lifelike. When Miss Macintyre is Rebecca, I can appreciate the jealous sting of Rowena's taunt to Sir Wilfrid in Thackeray's burlesque: "Torquilstone! *Where you were locked up with the Jewess in the Tower!*"

Transactions of the Guild and School of Handicraft. Edited by C. R. Ashbee. (Published by the Guild and School of Handicraft.)

L. F. AUSTIN.

CONTINENTAL COMMENTS.

Paris.

YOU know the famous saying of Alcibiades when he cut off his dog's tail and all Athens was excited about this little surgical operation. "I would rather," said the witty statesman, "that Athens should talk about my dog's tail than of the mutilated statues of Hermes!"

For the last month we, in Paris, have talked about scarcely anything but the tail of Alcibiades' dog, a fact conclusively showing that the political situation is all that can be desired. Evidently there can be no cloud on the horizon, and the political sea must be as calm as any lake, for such an incident as that of *Thermidor* to make such a stir. I am beyond suspicion in this matter, for I put a question to the Government upon the suppression of M. Victorien Sardou's piece at the Théâtre Français, and delivered a speech upon the subject which has been generally approved by the English Press. But while maintaining my opinion that the duty of the Ministry was to allow a drama to be played which insulted neither the Revolu tion nor the Republic, I repeat that in less tranquil times the incident would have passed almost unperceived. I do not complain of the discussions which have been provoked by M. Sardou's drama, or of the measure adopted against it; those discussions have enabled M. Clémenceau to show that he never will be capable of holding office, and have afforded the Liberal and Opportunist Republicans the opportunity of openly repudiating the excesses and crimes of the Terror. But these very discussions, which are not finished, which continue in the lobbies of the Chambers, in the newspapers, and in the Salons, show how completely our political situation is calculated to inspire confidence in the future.

Confidence in the future of the Republic is, indeed, so great that the movement of the old Conservatives towards the Government becomes more striking every day. This arises from the very nature

of things, for the great majority of people throughout the country, more and more weary of constitutional disputes, recognise only one Government as possible—that which for twenty years has given us peace abroad and order, with liberty, at home. The movement increases because the Comte de Paris does everything he can to alienate his remaining partisans. The Boulangist schemes, into which he sank, as in a swamp, to his very neck, shocked all the old Orleanists who placed honour above interest. The silly and insolent speech of M. d'Haussonville at Nîmes really caused the utmost irritation among the remaining Liberals who still believed in Monarchy, and even among the clergy themselves. Hitherto we have seen Popes excommunicating kings because those kings disobeyed them. Now, for the first time, we see a Pretender, who will never be a king, excommunicating a Pope because that Pope encourages the French Bishops and priests who are rallying to the Republic with Cardinal Lavigerie.

It is beyond all doubt that the principal strength of the Monarchical parties has hitherto been in the clergy, and that the progressive adhesion of the clergy to the Constitution of the Republic is gradually diminishing those parties. But to endeavour by threats and insults, like those of the speech at Nîmes, to retain the ecclesiastics, who are sick and tired of a useless war against the legal Government of their country, is the very height of bungling stupidity. The Comte de Paris was guilty of this stupidity in allowing his principal secretary to make the speech at Nîmes. Immediately afterwards the Papal delegate, who had just come from consulting the Pope in Rome, hesitated no longer, and passed the Rubicon with his friends to enter the Republic. They do not abandon their Tory programme, but they declare that the Republic is henceforth the necessary, the indispensable Government, to which everyone should adhere.

A few more speeches like that at Nîmes, and Philip VII. will stand alone, and have no claim to appropriate for himself the fine saying of Francis I.: "Tout est perdu, fors l'honneur."

JOSEPH REINACH,
Member of the French Chamber.

Berlin.

ON Irish Home Rule, nine out of every ten German politicians judge in close accordance with the views of the present British Government. A predisposing cause of this is the preference felt for Lord Salisbury's foreign policy as contrasted with Mr. Gladstone's. Rightly or wrongly, people in this country consider Mr. Gladstone's mental structure to be built up mainly of Latin, as distinct from Teutonic, elements, his sympathies going more readily with that current of European thought and aspiration which flows in France, in Italy, and in Spain. His methods, too, even when his object is applauded, appear open to that rapid change of front which, in diplomacy as well as in war, produces the greatest successes and occasionally reverses. It is thought impossible by most people in this country that Home Rule could be established without bloodshed, without the oppression of Ulster, or without the ultimate severance of the country from the British Crown. In the latter case it is considered a foregone conclusion that the Irish rulers would lean for support upon France, and that Irish-American rowdyism would practically become the arbiter of the national destinies.

These remarks apply to political circles only. Where you meet priests of the Roman Church and their influential lay partisans, you find unanimity in favour of Home Rule, because this implies for every priest within his parish a highly pleasant and profitable dictatorship, and for his friends a more complete control of Ireland than any European or American country at this moment seems willing to concede. Let it not be supposed, however, that politicians in Germany all incline towards the policy of that able statesman and attractive orator, Mr. Balfour. There are the select few with whom it has become a settled conviction that, unless Great Britain governs Ireland as she does India, by a benevolent but unbending absolutism, she must grant Home Rule and that speedily. Absolutism has done great things for Europe; but as for re-establishing it, the notion is absurd. To such Liberals as I am now speaking of, it appears that the *modicum* of Government interference allowed by

English usage, when applied to Ireland, invites mischief and instead of allaying discontent increases it a hundredfold. As for the landlord class, the advantage to the country at large of their residing on their estates is readily acknowledged. Yet, judging from historical precedent, the fact seems indisputable that those estates will have to be greatly curtailed in acreage: a measure which has been adopted during this century, with more or less of violence, in every country save, perhaps, Mecklenburg and England.

The course of recent events in the Balkan Peninsula shows that the difficulty of Home Rule is not insurmountable. Who could have been imagined less capable of self-government than the inhabitants of Roumania, Servia, and Bulgaria? They had never belonged, in a higher sense at least, to any body politic; the younger men rarely had so much as held an office; they had never served in a national army, but wasted their lives in idle hopelessness. Yet, are they not showing, in varied degrees, of course, a proper sense of responsibility and a self-controlling energy which bids fair to baffle the "knavish tricks" of the enemy on their frontier? It will be seen from the above rapid survey of German views on Home Rule that we are, at all events, not indifferent to that momentous question. We have but one desire, viz., to see it permanently settled, and a cause of constant anxiety and of weakness to Great Britain removed.

An interesting episode in the life of Goethe is just now receiving fresh light from a quarter whence such an addition to his biography would least have been expected, viz., in the forthcoming volume of *Talleyrand's Memoirs*. Napoleon I., as everybody knows, had expressed a wish to see Goethe during those brilliant pageants at Erfurt, when the actors of the Théâtre Français performed before a *parterre de rois*. Very little has been heard hitherto of the conversation that took place, excepting that, on Goethe quitting the room, the Emperor said, "*Voilà un homme!*" But here comes Prince Talleyrand, who was present, and who put the words then spoken on record—subsequently, as he affirms, showing his account to the poet for examination. The account is too interesting to be abridged.

"Charmed to see you, Monsieur Goethe."

"Sire, I perceive that during your travels your Majesty does not fail to turn your attention to very insignificant matters."

"I know that you are the first tragic poet in Germany."

"Sire, you wrong this country. We, too, think we have our great men. Schiller, Lessing, and Wieland must be known to your Majesty."

"Scarcely so, I confess. However, I read the *Thirty Years' War*, and, pardon me, but it seemed to me barely good enough to suggest tragic materials for our boulevard theatres."

"Sire, I am not acquainted with your boulevards I imagine that popular plays are enacted there; I am sorry to hear you judging with so much severity one of the finest minds of modern days."

"You live mostly at Weimar? That, I believe, is the spot where the famous writers of Germany are wont to assemble."

"Sire, they are treated with much attention there Of men, however, who are known throughout Europe we have at this moment but one in Weimar, namely, Wieland."

"I should like to see Monsieur Wieland."

"If your Majesty will allow me to send for him I feel certain that he will immediately appear."

"Does he speak French?"

"He understands it, and has revised several translations of his works into French."

"So long as you stay here be sure to come every evening to our theatrical performances. It will do you no harm to see good French plays performed."

"Sire, I shall go with the greatest pleasure, and I confess that such was my intention. I have myself translated, or rather imitated, a few French plays."

"Which?"

"*Mahomed* and *Tancred*."

"I will send to inquire of Rémusat whether we have actors here who can perform those plays. I should much like you to hear them in our language. You are not so strict in the rules of the drama as we are?"

"Sire, the unities are of no importance to us."

"What do you think of our stay here?"

"Sire, very brilliant, and, I hope, useful to the country."

"Are your people happy?"

"They are full of hope."

"Monsieur Goethe, you should stay here the whole time and describe the impression which the great spectacle we offer leaves upon your mind."

"Ah, Sire, it would require the pen of some writer of antiquity to undertake such a task."

"Are you one of those who like Tacitus?"

"Yes, Sire, much."

"Well, I do not. But of this another time. Write to Monsieur Wieland to come here. I shall return his call at Weimar, whither the Duke has invited me. I shall be very glad to see the Duchess. She is a highly gifted woman. The Duke acted badly for some time, but he has been reprimanded."

"Sire, if he did so, the reprimand was rather strong. However, I am no judge in such matters. He protects poetry and science, and we may all of us be very well satisfied with him."

"Monsieur Goethe, come and see *Iphigenia* to-night. It is a good play. Not exactly one of those I like best, but the French prize it highly. In my pit you will see a goodly number of sovereigns. Do you know the Prince Primate (Dalberg)?"

"Indeed I do, Sire; almost intimately. He is a prince of a very easy wit, of much knowledge, and of much magnanimity."

"Very well, you will see him sleeping on the King of Würtemburg's shoulders to-night. Did you ever see the Emperor of Russia?"

"No, Sire, never. But I hope to be presented to him."

"He speaks your language well. If you write anything about the meeting at Erfurt you must dedicate it to him."

"That is not my habit, Sire. When I began to write I made it a principle never to write a dedication, for fear of having to repent it one day."

"The great authors of Louis XIV.'s age thought differently."

"That is true, Sire, but your Majesty would not care to assure me that they never repented."

"What has become of that good-for-nothing fellow, Kotzebue?"

"Sire, people say he is in Siberia. And your Majesty will ask the Emperor Alexander for his release."

"But you know well enough that he is no favourite of mine."

"Sire, he is very unhappy, and a man of much talent."

"Good-bye, Monsieur Goethe."

It is safe to assert, I think, that the above account, although there may have been more words spoken, covers the entire range of this desultory yet masterly conversation. Prince Talleyrand may have chuckled, indeed it is very likely he did, whilst witnessing the rebuff so cleverly administered to his master's vanity. Yet it seems to me that internal evidence militates against any suspicion that the conversation has been artfully twisted in order to unduly exalt Goethe.

GEORGE VON BUNSEN.

Rome.

MY news this month is important enough, but unfortunately the substance of it is already known to you. Signor Crispi, who appeared to be omnipotent to all who were not very close observers, has fallen. It is clear that many causes contributed to his overthrow, but the principal were his financial mismanagement and the laws for the administrative reorganisation of the country, which conflicted with many interests. It is uncertain whether the words which were considered so offensive by the Moderate party were pronounced by him in the mere heat of the moment, or with premeditation. Signor Crispi, in answer to a sweeping attack upon him, declared that the last Ministry of the Right, of which I was a member, Signor Minghetti being Premier, had a servile foreign policy. That Ministry fell on March 18th, 1876. There was no need to say anything at all about it; and what Signor Crispi said was not true. Signor Minghetti has been dead three years. It was not generous to hurl such an insult at him. But why did Signor Crispi act in this manner? From lack of self-restraint, or of deliberate purpose? Either explanation is possible. Signor Crispi is not a great speaker, nor a very fluent one. From time to time he is stirring and effective, but his eloquence frequently hangs fire. Had he striven his hardest he could not have used words more calculated to lead to a breach with that portion of the Moderate party which he had cajoled, and which had cajoled him during the last few months, than those he employed. Indeed, it has been said that Signor Crispi, in order that the financial measure which was under discussion should be carried, had promised some members of the Left to speak as he did, and then, after the passing of the Bill, to resign, and form a Cabinet entirely from that side of the House. Be that as it may, we now have again, after fifteen years, a Cabinet almost completely composed of members of the Right. Signor Crispi miscalculated his power. Those unlucky words roused the indignation of all the members of the Moderate party, and many members who did not belong to it voted with them, because of the opportunity thus afforded of freeing themselves from him. The

majority against him was sixty-three, exactly the same as that by which Signor Minghetti was overthrown in 1876.

The Marquis of Rudini, a Sicilian, was entrusted by the King with the formation of the new Cabinet. He was the leader of that section of the Moderate party which had drawn nearer to Signor Crispi during the last few months, but was forced to vote against him on January 31st. The party behind the Marquis was not very strong. It consisted of forty members at most. He saw that he could not form his Cabinet with his own followers only, or even with the Moderate party alone. So he chose his Home Minister from the Left, and selected a clever but not a sure man, Signor Nicotera, who is a fierce enemy of Signor Crispi. The other Ministers he has found on the benches of the Right, the Right Centre, and the Left Centre. It is a scratch Cabinet. Only two members can be known in England, Signor Luzzatti, the Minister of the Treasury, a famous economist, and Professor Villari, the author of the *Life of Savonarola*, of which there is an English translation by his wife, an English lady.

The Cabinet presented itself to the House on the 14th. The Marquis read his programme. It is very simple. Since neither the House nor the country wishes to make good the deficit by imposing fresh taxes, economy will be resorted to. The expenditure for the army and navy will have to be diminished. The foreign policy will not be changed. This programme has been generally welcomed; but it is not easy to carry out. We have not yet been told how the saving is to be effected. We are to learn all about it on March 2nd, to which date the House has been adjourned. The Minister of War and the Minister of Marine will each have a hard nut to crack. They are both clever men, but they have to reduce expenditure without impairing efficiency, and therein lies the difficulty.

We have a very old man among us—he is eighty-one—who is bent double with anxieties and cares, and who yet finds time to amuse himself by writing Latin verses. I speak of Leo XIII. He has